DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 423 163 SO 028 492

AUTHOR Carnes, Virginia
TITLE Independent Schools - Independent Thinking - Independent Art: Testing Assumptions.
SPONS AGENCY Columbia Univ., New York, NY. Esther A. and Joseph Klingenstein Center for Independent School Education.
PUB DATE 1996-00-00
NOTE 87p.; This report results from the 1996 Klingenstein Fellows Program at Teachers College Columbia University.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Art; *Art Education; Discipline Based Art Education; Elementary Secondary Education; *Private Schools; Program Evaluation; Standards; Student Evaluation; *Visual Arts

ABSTRACT

This study consists of a review of selected educational reform issues from the past 10 years that deal with changing attitudes towards art and art instruction in the context of independent private sector schools. The major focus of the study is in visual arts and examines various programs and initiatives with an art focus. Programs include discipline based art education, advanced placement studio art portfolio, international baccalaureate art and design, arts PROPEL, national standards, interdisciplinary approaches, and the National Art Education Association. A review of literature and an annotated bibliography accompany the study. Data gathering included a mail survey and telephone interviews for additional information on the survey questions. Additional research is proposed to widen the understanding of independent school art programs. (EH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 423 163

INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS INDEPENDENT THINKING INDEPENDENT ART:

TESTING ASSUMPTIONS

KLINGENSTEIN FELLOWS PROGRAM
1996

VIRGINIA CARNES

SO 028 492

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. R. Kane

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Thank you to Dr. William Clarkson, IV, The Westminster Schools, Atlanta, GA and Dr. Pearl R. Kane, The Klingenstein Center, Teachers College Columbia University for their individual and institutional support. Thank you also to all those who responded so willingly in returning the survey and in sharing additional information via telephone conversations.

May, 1996
Virginia Carnes

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....1

PROGRAM REVIEW.....5

SELECTION.....5

DISCIPLINE BASED ART EDUCATION.....6

ADVANCED PLACEMENT STUDIO ART PORTFOLIO.....14

INTERNATIONAL BACCALAUREATE ART AND DESIGN.....16

ARTS PROPEL.....18

NATIONAL STANDARDS.....20

INTERDISCIPLINARY.....22

NATIONAL ART EDUCATION ASSOCIATION.....24

SURVEY.....25

PURPOSE.....25

SCHOOL SELECTION.....25

SURVEY RETURNS.....26

SURVEY QUESTIONS.....27

RESPONSE RESULTS.....27

TELEPHONE INTERVIEWS.....34

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS.....39

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY.....42

DISCIPLINE BASED ART EDUCATION.....42

ADVANCED PLACEMENT
AND INTERNATIONAL BACCALAUREATE.....56

ARTS PROPEL.....60

NATIONAL STANDARDS.....62
APPENDIX.....66
SCHOOLS RETURNING SURVEY FORMS.....66
SCHOOLS INTERVIEWED BY PHONE.....68
SURVEY FORM.....70
CONTACT RESOURCES.....72
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....75

INTRODUCTION

Independence. What a great word, unfettered, free, at liberty to choose, unlicensed, and personally in charge. Just how free are we? Is freedom and independence, if indeed it does exist, a good thing ? In reality, we find ourselves boxed into a number of circumstances that confine rather than free our practice in teaching art. Traditional curriculum structures in our schools are limited by college admission practice, parent expectations, test scores and fear of risk taking. (Wilson, in Kane, 1991) Athletic participation, fixed schedules, and attitudes embedded in the school culture may further control the place of the arts in the school. So, where is all this independence? It is likely that we find and protect much of our sense of independence within the confines of our classrooms and studios.

Traditionally, by design, teachers are encouraged to develop independently and to structure a learning program that is, for the most part, far removed from the remainder of the curriculum. Many of us teach in isolation as the only art teacher in smaller schools or singly in one division of larger institutions. When hired, the art teacher may be offered little more than a brief course description, perhaps a line or two published as part of the annual course directory. In the past, syllabi from ongoing established programs may not have been written down. Required textbooks are rarely part of the picture. In the absence of established programs, art instruction depends on personal models brought to the job, prior teaching practice, or recent experiences as art students.

Teaching art allows and even requires invention, flexibility, and freedom as we invent our own programs. I suspect that even in the interview process few are asked about how we intend to go about this business. I can recall my own experience in being asked only how messy art teaching needed to be. No questions followed along philosophical lines or approached the idea that objectives might be pertinent. As long as art exhibits are in evidence, students and parents satisfied, behaviors under control and complaints from the maintenance staff few and far between, chances are the art teacher is left to his or her own devices.

Perhaps this is not very different from other disciplines in the independent school. However, the newly minted math or English hire is more likely to be greeted upon arrival by a full department, lists of required texts and a syllabus which has been in place for a considerable period of time. New teachers fit themselves into an established program of scope and sequence expecting that students will arrive with information on which to build the term's learning. At terms end, a very specific body of knowledge will have been imparted with the expectation that students are prepared to move on to greater complexity and depth.

Generally, arts teachers get to do it all and do it the way they want it done. Content, style, media and pedagogy are all within our control. We have it all in our heads. Some are careful to write it down; some keep notebooks and teaching journals to look back on, while many just rely on the immediate situation to keep the pace. Some have escaped from public institutions where the burden of constant lesson plan writing in behavioral terminology or bureaucratic formula takes time away from direct teaching.

Teaching art can be an enormously creative activity. We can get up in the morning fresh with a new approach and try it out almost immediately. Many of us are richly endowed with the resources and facilities that provide for even greater flexibility, spontaneity and invention. Teaching becomes an ongoing event that keeps us alive. Without this possibility of continued invention, many of us would long ago have opted for more fertile ground on which to expend our creative energies. Without the burden of administrators nosing about, our studios can become havens of free enterprise. Being on the margins is not necessarily the worst place we can find ourselves.

The relative small size of our schools and lack of bureaucratic structure, as compared to the public sector, does `provides the opportunity of collegiality. Our role as teacher expands to coach, advisor and administrator. (Bullard, in Kane, 1991) This collegiality and multiplicity of roles enables us to move beyond the confines of our classrooms and studios. We have as a result, rare opportunities to engage the larger community in an understanding of our practice. As we move into that outer sphere, we may find it necessary to educate not only the students enrolled in our classes but the culture in which we find ourselves. Parents need to know what is learned through painting and performance beyond the visible product. Administrators may need very

specific information on cognitive development, the value of assessment, and the place of art as a deeper study of the human condition. This communication needs to go beyond special art exhibits, occasional visiting artists with demonstrations, or the once-a-year festival. It needs to get at the heart of our teaching practice, not as entertainment but as education. Taking full advantage of opportunity can provide for an even greater stake in the whole with an increased measure of freedom.

The teaching of art cannot be left to haphazard circumstances, or the accidental hiring of a person of artistic skill, intellect, integrity, great good will and the energy it takes to engage the entire community in the endeavor. Planning, along with consistent reflection is paramount if, we are to fulfill with meaning, the the satisfying picture Maxine Greene envisions of our world as, "sophisticated places where creativity can be nurtured, the sense of craft encouraged, and personal expression of many sorts affirmed ", (Greene, in Kane ,1992, 190).

In 1985, the National Association of Independent Schools recognized the growth of arts programming in publishing the, NAIS Arts Planning Group Report. (NAIS, 1985) This acknowledged a significant advancement of sound arts education in the independent sector making recommendations for continued growth and support. A great deal has happened since 1985 in the national arts education movement. National programs have expanded with ever increasing numbers while the arts have come to take a place within the dialogue of school reform movements. The independent arts education community has much to contribute and gain through a continued dialogue with these national efforts.

Our situation has abundant appeal but carries with it a great responsibility. The choice is ours and with it come the burdens of success or failure of that program we devise on our own. Without a support system of thoughtfully established programs, those models we carry around in our heads become ever so important. Without colleagues in our field to listen, compare notes and discuss issues, we have little to go on but ourselves. However large our experience, that experience may be limited by the mental models we hold to. It becomes necessary to get beyond the limits of self and take in new information. We have the freedom to accept or reject. In order to exercise this freedom to its fullest, it may be necessary to invite in a host of information. We cannot in all good faith accept or dismiss information casually without thorough investigation,

knowing why we accept or reject it. There is more than enough information on the market these days. Those of us of long experience as well as those new in the game owe it to ourselves, our institutions, and most of all to the students we seek to nurture, to ground our teaching within a well researched philosophy that we believe in. As a person on the shorter end of the continuum I find it of the utmost importance to continue the process of revisiting assumptions, while reflecting on my daily practice, lest it become static in comfortable repetition. Research along with some excellent writing continues to provide issues for reflection on procedures and practice. As practicing artists, reflection and revision based on the continual arrival of new information as our work develops energizes that process. Our teaching practice needs a similarly reflective attitude to keep it alive. The current study is undertaken with this in mind.

THE STUDY

This study consists of a review of selected issues that over the course of the past ten years have in some way touched on reforms seeking to change attitudes towards and subsequently the teaching of art. Although some of the material collected and topics involve the larger field of arts education, the major focus of this study is in visual arts. Along with the review of literature, an annotated bibliography has been collected.

I also wanted to know to what extent these ongoing issues had impacted the curriculum decision process in the independent sector. To accomplish this, a survey was developed and conducted by mail to gather data. Telephone interviews were then conducted to elicit additional information and more in depth personal comments on survey questions. The survey, resulting data, and information collected are reported on and discussed in the last section.

In the conclusion, additional research is proposed to widen the understanding of independent school art programs. In addition, I reflect on the readings, information from the survey and my own experience in undertaking this project and teaching background. Most of all, I want to test my own assumptions and practice in a continuing quest to improve that practice from a firmly grounded base.

PROGRAM REVIEW

SELECTION OF PROGRAMS

In selecting programs to include, consideration was given to those having a research base or an extended history of practical experience. The Advanced Placement Portfolio Program of the College Board (AP) has had a long history beginning in 1972 and so it seemed an obvious choice. The Getty Center for Education in the Arts (GCEA) has generated considerable controversy among art educators since its beginnings in the 1980's, so it too seemed a likely candidate for investigation. As the major representative of the art education profession at the secondary level, The National Art Education Association (NAEA) continues to be a center for the dissemination of information, support and research open to both public and private schools. The move to National Standards (NS) and the publication of these standards in the arts should also be acknowledged. The International Baccalaureate Program (IB) although small, provides a student centered and world view approach to art learning important to consider. ARTS PROPEL is included for its attention to process and portfolio evaluation procedures. All of these initiatives have become part of the literature of educational reform along with a growing interest that includes the arts in interdisciplinary studies. The inclusion of these initiatives is not intended to promote or endorse any particular point of view but rather to provide a range of possible sources. There are also many other programs and investigations that continue to help frame practice and philosophy in teaching. I encourage the independent art teaching community to search out any program that might prove useful. Blessed with the freedom to choose, it is expected that choice will remain a dominant feature of arts education.

What follows, is an overview of each of the programs. Included in the appendix is a resource list of contact points for programs having that information available. The annotated bibliographies at the end are divided into program specific sections, and thus allow for additional individual reading in each of the major areas. This is not however, intended as a complete listing of everything available on these issues.

DISCIPLINE - BASED ART EDUCATION

Discipline-based art education, (DBAE), has stirred up the art education community as no other project, proposal, or initiative, generating heated discussion. Whether or not individual independent school art teachers take hold of this approach in its entirety, or take bits and pieces, or reject it, it is important to acknowledge its considerable impact on the profession. Discussion has at times been passionate, resolute sides taken and new ideas generated to fuel the fire or calm the critics. In recent years, the furor has softened. DBAE has garnered support from national organizations that include The College Board, National School Boards Associations, National Endowment for the Arts and the National Art Education Association. Considerable influence is also evident in new textbook publications while revisions of older texts are including DBAE references. (Greer, 1993)

The expression of topics and ongoing discussion are signs of healthy interest in a field too long ignored beyond the confines of the single studio classroom. A number of alternative approaches have been developed that extend the ideas of DBAE or provide other avenues to quality art programs. (Burton, 1988) The literature available is extensive. An ERIC search covering 1983 - 1995 designating DBAE brought up eighty four articles. Publications such as *Educational Theory*, (vol. 40, no.4), *Studies in Art Education*, (vol 28, no. 4) and *The Journal of Aesthetic Education*, (summer 1987) have devoted nearly entire issues to panels and series of articles on this topic. The length of the overview in this study devoted to DBAE, is not due to advocacy or argument but merely to the quantity of material. Hardly an article on any aspect of teaching art does not acknowledge DBAE however slight the mention. Much of the literature is dedicated either to promoting the program by those close to development, or the opposition taking a critical stance on one or more issues.

It is not the intent of this survey to take sides but rather to comment on what DBAE has to offer independent educators. First, a brief history of the development of DBAE, its origins and then an overview of what the literature outlines as the DBAE approach with a review of some of the critics.

What is known as DBAE had its formal beginnings in 1982 when the J. Paul Getty Trust

established the Getty Center for Education in the Arts (GCEA) as an operating program (Eisner, 1990). For the first time, substantial financial support became available for promoting and maintaining research and development in art education. The funding was capable of creating an impact nationally (Eisner, 1990). The mission and purpose of GCEA is stated simply , " to improve the quality and status of arts education in America's Schools." (Duke, 1988) From the start, the focus was, and continues to be, on public education. That system, particularly in regard to arts education, was viewed as flawed, lacking in rigorous academic approaches with art serving a minimal. The mission could only be accomplished if a critical mass of participation could be moved to change. This required massive funding and a national effort.

Following a study of then current art education practice it was the view of the Getty that the studio model was satisfactory for only a few interested and talented students while the large majority had little if any contact with art. Even those engaged in studio practice were felt to be lacking in the ability to understand or interpret the historical and critical nature of art or to derive real knowledge from that experience (Duke 1988). This marginalization of art is attributed to a lack of content and rigor in programs. The activity of art was viewed as therapeutic with a high degree of emphasis on idiosyncratic personal expression and loose notions of creativity, and offering little in the way of cognitive value. Missing too were sufficient references to cultural context, historical development, or critical evaluation (Duke,1988).

Prior to the adoption of the DBAE plan by GCEA, considerable work had been accomplished in attempting to solve these problems. These ideas would ultimately come together under the sponsorship of the Getty Foundation. The Getty Center did not create the conception of DBAE but rather brought together a group of educators whose work matched many of the assumptions mentioned above. The origins of the present program can be traced to the work of art educators and educational philosophers of the mid-sixties. This list includes, Manuel Barkan, Harry Broudy, Elliot Eisner, Ralph Smith, Mary Rouse, Laura Chapman, Stanley Madeja, Guy Hubbard, and Frances Hine (Efland, 1987) (Eisner, 1990) (Greer, 1992). Early projects included CEMREL , SWRL, the Kettering project and the development of a textbook series by Rouse and Hubbard. (Efland, 1987) In the early 1950's Broudy began to develop the idea of aesthetics as a foundation for an educational philosophy. The ideas of Broudy were selected by

W. Dwaine Greer as the foundation for his own work in curriculum development. (Greer, 1992) Broudy developed a process known as "scanning" , a vocabulary for analyzing works of art that allowed those not trained in art to begin communicating on aesthetic properties. This technique has become an important part of aesthetic learning in DBAE. (Broudy, 1990) Further collaborative work by Broudy and Greer in 1974/75 on The Aesthetic Eye Project allowed both to work with teachers, testing and expanding their ideas. (Greer, 1992)

At the invitation of the Getty Trust, Greer developed a summer institute bringing in both Broudy and his ideas. This first institute in 1983, held in Los Angeles, brought teams of teachers and principals from seven Los Angeles County school districts. The team approach has become a standard feature of DBAE training. The center continues to generate reports, studies, workshops and conferences to promote, disseminate and evaluate the program. Participation in national educational conferences such as the National Art Education Association has invited a larger audience.

Institutes were held not only for teachers but for school board members and superintendents of schools. Thus, by bringing in all constituents, a support system could be developed along with the program. The success of this may be seen through supportive leadership such as that generated by an Ohio superintendent who encourages administrators to take an active role (McMurrin, 1989). The need for administrative support is further developed by Michael Day in an article hypothesizing a visit by two secondary principals to a school where the DBAE approach is in place. As we move with them in the article through the school, questions are posed on budgets, curriculum, advanced course offerings and resources. Responses explain the ideas behind DBAE as well as solutions to problems that visitors pose. The host points to an excellent slide collection, success in Advanced Placement Programs and concerns for career counseling, all attributable to the excellence of the program. (Day, 1989)

The instructional model outlined as the DBAE approach is characterized first by adding the study of aesthetics, art history and art criticism.to the studio experience. Professional models of practice and behavior are used to develop a program of integrated instruction. Learning is sequenced with increasing complexity from grade level to grade level with an emphasis on problem solving. An important characteristic is the insistence on a written curriculum that is systematic

across grade levels. Accountability follows as an essential component. Much of this accountability may come in the form of traditional paper and pencil methods in essay writing or multiple choice testing (Hamblen, 1987). From the beginning, evaluation has been inherent in Getty programs. The institutes themselves have been evaluated in terms of participants response to the experience, and how has that experience been translated into successful teaching practice in classrooms. (Rubin, 1989)

DBAE has not been promoted as a curriculum but rather as a framework around which curriculum develops. Classroom applications may be seen in the literature surveyed. Teachers are encouraged to develop their own courses within the frame resulting in considerable variety. One such model provided by a secondary teacher divides art learning into two distinct courses. An academic course focuses on art history, appreciation and criticism using museum visits via video, lecture, writing assignments and readings. Lecture provides an understanding of technique and media. Traditional evaluation is followed through testing, examinations and the grading of written critiques and reports. The course runs concurrently with a second and separate studio course (Kindler, 1992).

In an earlier study, Michael Day describes a series of units designed to test and apply the theories of DBAE in action. Eighth grade students were instructed for six weeks on the major elements of cubism in a series of lessons that integrated studio experiences with critical and art historical information. In the same article, two other studies are reported on with similar focus (Day, 1987).

Another example of the structure an art lesson might take based on DBAE principles may be found in Rush, 1987. A series of lessons on contour line links the basic ideas of DBAE in production, as well as in historical, visual and critical analysis. Each of the artistic domains are constructed in the lesson so that students operate as close as possible to model professionals in the field. Images of artists are shown to build a background of interlocking information and relate the work of other artists to student work. Aesthetic scanning, the system mentioned earlier developed by Broudy, is used to identify visual concepts in works by artists and students (Rush, 1987).

David Amdur describes an interdisciplinary approach in a sample unit on prehistoric

cultures. Art , social studies and literature are linked in this study contrasting neolithic and paleolithic cultures (1993).

The GCEA publishes its own series of sample lessons. These do not provide a full blown step-by-step curriculum, but rather a set of examples that teachers can use as a resource. (Day, 1991) This volume serves as an idea bank and reference for art teachers, or, can become prescriptive for the general teacher needing more direct information, thus providing a base from which to develop classroom lessons. Proponents consistently point out that DBAE provides a framework, and that no attempt is made to develop a nation wide curriculum for all schools. (Dobbs, 1989)

As schools move to greater familiarity with and use of technology in visual arts programing, expansion of DBAE would seem inevitable. Opportunities to move back and forth between resource information in history, criticism, aesthetics and the creation of visual images is enhanced for cross-discipline initiatives. DBAE applications for hypermedia were presented at the recent, 1996 conference of The National Art Education Association.

Assessment is a major component of the DBAE approach, since evaluation is a key factor in validating the success of individual learning. (Day, 1985) In writing on evaluation, Getty proponents have been critical of the notion that assessment should be primarily tied to growth and development, a belief promoted by Lowenfeld which has served as the model since the 40's. Michael Day is particularly clear in contrasting the traditional Lowenfeld model with that of DBAE. (Day, 1985) Blanche Rubin refers to an irresponsible attitude on the part of teachers who shrink from evaluations procedures in art that would force revision and review of work in the misguided notion that enjoyment of art will be diminished by real learning. (Rubin, 1989) Eisner points to a lack of serious assessment as limiting the role that the arts have in relation to other subjects and college admission. (Eisner, 1987)

Discipline-based teaching insists that evaluation be tied directly to learning. In the belief that clearly articulated instruction based on the acquisition of very specific knowledge and skills can be evaluated with relative ease, the stage is set for a more standard approach to testing that information. Criteria becomes directly referenced back to learning content. In DBAE, it is the systematic basis of the curriculum that assists that process with evaluation taking place in all of the

four learning areas. (Day, 1985) The evaluation of work in the history, aesthetic and critical domains will depend on language skills both oral and written, while assessment in studio practice will tend to focus on the acquisition of skill in handling media or demonstration of formal properties. Criteria referenced evaluation is suggested by Gentile and Murnyack (1989) as particularly responsive to a DBAE approach where instructional objectives are broken into very specific bits of knowledge.

Although differences may be mandated by local constraints and needs, all versions of DBAE will share major commonalities. First, art must be made an integral part of the general program of study as a subject with all four of the learning domains included. This program of study should be sequential from grade to grade with a written curriculum. Second, evaluation must be systematic, based on skills mastered and knowledge acquired. Third, administrative support must provide resources and staff development in a program, and throughout an entire system. (Dobbs, 1989)

The importance of moving beyond the studio to embrace other art disciplines in a partnership for learning has been the strongest point of difference between DBAE and more traditional formats where studio practice and the manipulation of media have dominated. Many of these studio based programs are seen by DBAE advocates as lacking in content, structure and direction (Eisner, 1987). Activities in the studio consuming art materials may be a great escape with art making linked to recreation or hobby programs. (Sylva, 1993) Creativity and self-expression are often designated as a major purpose in the pursuit of art. (Dobbs, 1989)

Eisner makes four basic assumptions about art learning that forms a central core of beliefs around which this approach is formulated. First, students need opportunities to learn and acquire knowledge; second, making and understanding art takes time, effort, repetition and practice; third, learning must take place within developmental capacities; and fourth, learning must be meaningful. (1987)

The importance of a written curriculum means that an entire district will be able to encourage continuity of art instruction from year to year, school to school. Using texts along with a clearly visible curriculum also gives a sense of stability placing art within the academic realm. (Eisner, 1987) Where a DBAE curriculum frame is in place through the middle years, continuity

of art teaching would bring to the high school years a body of knowledge to build on as well as the more traditional experience with media. (MacGregor)

Critics of this approach generally resist the shift away from a studio based experience, insisting instead on direct involvement with art materials. It is suggested that critics of the studio approach have failed to differentiate between poor teaching and the value of those experiences taught with insight and knowledge (Burton, 1994). The problem solving approach of DBAE is seen as far too narrow to take in the richness of art (London, 1988). Learning then reduces art to the limitations of a formal approach, placing personal expression aside as tangential. Success in the expressive is far more difficult to evaluate while formal properties in the elements of art more likely to lend themselves to the criteria referenced method. Teaching on a purely formalist level could reduce art experiences to easily managed bits of information such as the construction of color wheels or design problems with predictable outcomes.

The division of art into distinct domains further divides the art experience. In that these divisions are inventions, they align themselves neatly with the departmentalization of schools. This division and compartmentalization continues just the kind of situation most in need of reform. (London, 1988) Real art does not divide itself into neatly packaged quarters, it is a messy business with continued interaction among its parts. The making of art is promoted as a unified whole experience where issues of aesthetics and criticism
are embedded in that process. Pulling them out and away removes richness from that encounter while an integrated approach would maintain those important relationships that help learners integrate the expression of very personal ideas. (Burton, 1988)

Art educators, for whom the developmental process is key to establishing curriculum in art, view DBAE as an artificial construct which denies the need for the natural development of complexity with growth (Lederman, 1988). None of these critics would rush to a program solely based on direct experience without structure, but rather promote a balance of experiences that bring all artistic domains into the studio. Imaginative and expressive qualities remain central with genuine inquiry based on those experiences as direct information growing from that practice. (Burton, 1988)

It is further argued that the focus on content with a delivery system that is linguistic

develops a model that is removed from student life experiences (Brigham, 1988). Three of the four domains: art history, aesthetics, and criticism have oral and or written language as their mode of expression. Proponents of DBAE have argued that this approach opens more opportunities for students who want contact with art learning but operate more successfully within language and would opt out of a studio based experience. This is more likely at the high school level where experiential art remains primarily an elective.

There are limitations in any one approach. Good practice has always included discussion of criticism and used historical references for ongoing work. It remains for those of us in independent education to decide to what extent and how that information should be delivered. If the move is made to formalize instruction into separate domains as promoted by DBAE we may indeed lose something in the studio experience. On the other hand, studio practice that is limited to skill development and the manipulation of media can quickly fall into just the type of programs that DBAE seeks to overcome. A wealth of information exists on this approach, we owe it to ourselves and to our institutions to be well informed while in the end, it remains for each of us to make those all important decisions.

ADVANCED PLACEMENT AND INTERNATIONAL BACCALAUREATE

The Advanced Placement Portfolio Examination and the International Baccalaureate share a number of common ideas. Both offer strong preparatory programs with the additional advantage of possible college credit for work accomplished during the secondary years. The preparation of an individual portfolio that focuses on student centered initiatives with the teacher serving as facilitator or coach is another shared characteristic. Additionally, neither of these programs seek to limit participation to students of unusual talent. Participation is open to the larger population of students with ability and interest that may or may not choose to major in visual arts. Assessment in both programs takes place beyond the classroom through an independent process. Both offer institutes and workshop programs for teachers seeking to begin programs as well as for those with experience. Support material, in the form of published course descriptions,

teachers guides, slides, and the assessment process is available. Following is a brief description of each of these programs.

ADVANCED PLACEMENT STUDIO PORTFOLIOS

The Advanced Placement Studio Art Program of the College Board has been in place since 1972 beginning with the general portfolio. In 1980, the drawing portfolio was added. In 1995 total national portfolio submissions reached 7, 678 with 2,493 of those submitted in drawing and 5,185 in the general category. It is unknown how many of the portfolios submitted came from independent schools. Revision and careful monitoring of this program by a development committee consisting of both secondary and college faculty assures consistency and oversight. Educational Testing Service is directly responsible for the administration and scoring of the adjudication process while the College Board maintains ultimate oversight and controls test development. Although the College Board is a membership organization, any school regardless of membership status may participate in any of the AP programs. As in all AP programs, fees are charged for the submission of portfolios.

Faculty consultants hired to grade portfolios are drawn from the ranks of college teaching faculties with close connections to freshman level work and high school teachers experienced in portfolio submissions. Consultants are carefully selected and serve for limited terms, thus assuring continued representation from variety of points of view, geographic distribution and types of schools. Faculty from both secondary and college level programs are invited to apply for a position as faculty consultant. The adjudication process is monitored by faculty with experience as consultants and examiners from Educational Testing Service. Prior to the actual grading, on site training and review of standards is provided for both old and new readers while at the close of the process, an immediate on site evaluation is held to get a sense of the process for that year. Statistical reports are available through regional offices of the College Board on participation, populations and grading.

Two distinct portfolios are offered. Students may select one or both portfolios but two

may not be submitted in the same year. One portfolio is dedicated solely to drawing, while the other, the general portfolio, addresses a broad range of media. Style, specific content, subject and media are for the most part the choice of students and their teachers. The general portfolio does require the inclusion of works that clearly show competence in design, color and three dimensional media.

Each portfolio is subdivided into three distinct sections. In part I (original) of both drawing and general portfolios, students submit original works. Part II (concentration) focuses on a unified group of images or objects conceived as an integrated body of works dedicated to a single idea, series, or theme as a visual essay or exhibit. Students may include sketches or developmental works relevant to the selected topic or series. The third segment (breadth) asks for works that show a range of experiences in media, style, content and approach. Drawing portfolios are restricted to drawing technique while the general portfolio requires broader media presentation. Specific guidelines for all aspects of both portfolios are available in poster form and in the publication Advanced Placement Course Description. A teacher's guide reviews a number of settings that approach curriculum development and the structure of the program in a variety of ways (Carnes, 1992).

Published guidelines covering submission in both portfolios are clear in pointing out that there is no prescriptive curriculum or definitive syllabus. Teachers may construct the design of courses to satisfy individual needs and strengths of students and school characteristics. Some portfolios result through experiences over a two year period in a number of classes. Team teaching or independent study is another option for schools without dedicated class periods. The course description establishes a framework that provides for considerable input from both teachers and students.

Despite the longevity of the program, very little literature has developed either in support or as criticism of the program. In 1991, The Council for Basic Education considered six case studies of performance assessment including the AP portfolio as one part of the study. The report concludes that the integrity of this program might well serve as the model for other programs. (Mitchell, 1991) One program in Winnetka, Illinois is briefly mentioned as part of another larger series of case studies that focus on programs for the gifted and talented. (Clark,

Zimmerman, 1994) In 1995, the Center for Performance Assessment studied the portfolio review process through an examination of selected score results particularly in reference to those scoring situations that showed some diversity of judgment. Faculty consultants were interviewed during the reading process for insight and comments directly related to that process. (Myford, 1995) Recent studies have also been initiated to investigate comparable course coverage and focus at both secondary and collegiate levels. The NAIS Arts Planning Group Report of 1984 recommends AP programming in all applicable disciplines and where appropriate. (NAIS, 1984)

THE INTERNATIONAL BACCALAUREATE / ART AND DESIGN

Founded in the mid-1960's, the International Baccalaureate is a university entrance examination program based on a curriculum that can be accomplished in any country in the world. This world view program is designed to accommodate educational needs in a variety of settings and thus does not follow specific preferences of any single country. Objectives of the program are , " to provide students with a balanced education; to facilitate geographic and cultural mobility; and to promote international understanding through a shared academic experience." (IB Materials) Currently operating in three languages, English, French, and Spanish, IB is headquartered in Geneva, Switzerland. More than five hundred schools participate world wide, one hundred eighty of these are in the United States. Independent school participation in 1996 totaled fifteen schools. Only those schools approved by the organization and paying fees are authorized to present candidates for the examination process. (IB, Materials)

The Art / Design portion of the IB program is an elective course within the IB curriculum. A two year program offering two course levels, higher and subsidiary. To earn the diploma, three of six core study areas must be taken at each of the two levels. Art and Design may be taken at either level. Higher level art students submit work in both studio and research. The subsidiary level asks that students select either studio or the research approach. Both are two year courses.

The research project requirements are the same for both levels taking place over a two year span. The submission for evaluation is presented in the form of a workbook / journal. The

journal may include sketches, finished art works, written information, gallery or museum visits relevant to the topic of study, or any form of evidence that substantially documents a thorough investigation and understanding of the inquiry . Personal critique on the progress of the study along with teacher comments are encouraged. The resulting workbook should not be considered as a sketchbook but rather a working journal. Topics are individually selected by students. Workbooks at the higher level receive 30% of the total evaluation. For students selecting the research option, 100% of the grade will be based on the workbook.

Studio work is also a two year program. The recommended program of study should include work in formal elements of design, color and composition as well as work that is more personal, expressive and experimental. Experiences should cover a range of media and techniques. Candidates present work in the form of an exhibition. The presentation includes finished work as well as preparatory and developmental works, or works that might be considered as failing to achieve an objectives. Evaluation for higher level candidates is assessed at 70 % while at 100% for subsidiary levels.

Evaluators review finished work along with significant attention to process as evidence of development. Students are expected to continually assess and evaluate their own work throughout the two year study. Teachers are required to evaluate student progress in a consistent and regular basis during the two year study. Final examination is both internal and external. Teachers evaluate for an internal assessment. An outside examiner selected by the school is invited to review work on site for the external portion of the final evaluation. Complete and detailed information on both curriculum requirements and the evaluation process are available through the IB program. Additionally, slides of student sample works with examiner comments may be purchased.

Little in the way of expanded comment is available on the IB program outside of articles written by those close to and involved with the process. It has generated little if any criticism. A two page descriptive article with illustrations appeared in the May 1993 issue of School Arts by F. Graeme Chalmers who at that time was the chief examiner for IB Art and Design. Tom Anderson, another examiner reports on the program in the March 1994 issue of Art Education. He relates the IB format to DBAE as a positive example of a discipline approach incorporating

the four essential domains in a studio setting. In that the studio option is student centered encouraging personal expression with imagination, the program seems to embrace much of the best ideas promoted by those both for and against the DBAE format. It seems particularly appealing to secondary art education in the independent sector as much of what is proposed and outlined in IB may already be in practice. It is unknown if any statistical or case studies of this program have been undertaken.

ARTS PROPEL

The arts propel approach to arts education seeks to develop assessment instruments for the documentation of learning. Founded in 1967 by Nelson Goodman, Project Zero began at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. At that time, Goodman became interested in challenging currently held beliefs that linguistic and logical systems of learning had a higher priority than expressive modes such as art or music, or dance and movement. His focus on a cognitive approach to symbol systems in the arts attracted the attention of other scholars including Howard Gardner and David Perkins. Originally devoted to psychological investigations, projects later moved into educational issues. Arts Propel became one of the efforts in this shift from analysis and theory to application. (Gardner, 1989) An increased interest in cognitive development in the arts by Goodman, Gombrich, Arnheim and others, supported the work of Howard Gardner. (Gardner, 1983) Gardner believes in a cognitive view of artistic engagement and that competence is gained from the understanding of and use of artistic symbols such as paintings (Gardner, 1983).

Arts Propel was developed with the support of the Rockefeller Foundation under the direction of researchers at Project Zero and Educational Testing Service. From 1986 to 1991 it was tested in field work with the cooperation and help of the Pittsburgh Public School System, Pittsburgh, PA. (Winner, 1993)

The project has at its core a program of student directed learning and assessment. Assessment centers on the integration of production, perception and reflection developed within a

model for engaging in art activities. A sequential curriculum ordering concepts and principals is neither developed nor embraced, nor is curriculum content required or suggested. For Arts PROPEL, content is integrated with process. Schools and teachers are encouraged to develop content out of their own needs with students as primary in the selection of media and direction. Students working in this learning environment develop portfolios focused on process. The contents of the portfolios serve as a kind of data base of information. (Gardner, 1987) Included might be written work, commentary, finished work, or work in progress. (Gitomer, 1992) The emphasis on process as development draws close comparison with the IB outline for both the studio and workbook research project (IB materials). Those students exposed to this method of art instruction in middle school years may find an easy transition to an IB curriculum. The concentration section, (part II) of the AP portfolio is also open to process in that developmental sketches may be submitted as evidence in support of a series or investigation (AP materials).

To briefly sketch out the basic tenets of Arts PROPEL, let's begin with a summary of what Gardner presents as major points. First, production must be central to art with students actively engaged in making art. Knowledge of critical ideas, history, and aesthetics should derive directly from that engagement of process. Where DBAE sees these domains as separate disciplines, Arts PROPEL would have them fully embedded in the working process. Masterwork examples in painting, sculpture, etc. when used should be directly related to the work at hand. Arts teaching should be done by those who can present more than surface information. Teachers should also be artistic thinkers. Projects should be meaningful, extend for a length of time sufficient for reflection, and discussion. What is does not do is present a sequential curriculum of skills, content and knowledge as sets of problems to be organized by grade levels, nor does is any curriculum prescribed. Gardner promotes the idea that in depth study of one art form is preferred to the survey experience with minimal exposure. To learn one form well will develop habits and frames for thinking that will later extend to other forms. Assessment is central and refers to ongoing work. (Gardner, 1989)

Assessment is not based solely on an isolated grade for finished pieces, but rather for a series of works developed over time. Students are participants in the evaluation process engaging fully in ongoing assessment that proceeds along with studio engagement. (Gitomer, Grosh, Price,

1992) Formal interviews between student and teacher will occur most often with older populations. What is termed the rolling interview is ongoing with portfolios always available for review and is suggested for younger groups. (Gitomer, Grosh, Price, 1992) Both methods may be used to advantage and are advised in developing both AP and IB portfolios.

Arts PROPEL is flexible enough for application in a number of settings. It places the studio and personal experience of art at the center while also enriches that experience with investigation of that process. (Zessoules, Wolf, Gardner) Critics of DBAE have included this approach as a positive alternative. (Burton, 1988) At its most basic level, it asks that the assessment process be part of the learning program. Good studio criticism, done well, that has as its aim the sensitive appraisal of works in progress may reflect many of the ideas of Arts PROPEL. The cognitive research base that programs such as this develop may indeed help to legitimize long standing studio practice. Numerical or letter grades in art are next to useless, while sensitive, well thought out informed criticism is not only useful but often the catalyst that moves work forward.

NATIONAL STANDARDS IN ART EDUCATION

Standards in all disciplines were outlined through the national education agenda in Goals 2000. Standards in the arts are the result of a collaborative effort among the major associations of teachers of arts, visual, music, dance and theater. Published in 1994, discussion has been healthy and hearty. Now that a set of standards is in print, we can all take a look. Standards are available for all arts discipline with those dedicated to the visual arts published by NAEA. They are voluntary and therefore carry little necessity for those of us in the independent sector. They may be hauled off the shelf as a flurry of activity bubbles up when the regional evaluation process comes to call but otherwise are likely to remain on that shelf. They do, however, hold the possibility of some use. They can serve as a framework to question practice and ground reflection, another voice to measure ideas against. Standards might also play a role as advocate in garnering community support . Generally speaking, experts are people from out of town and we are at times viewed as too close to the matter to give objective advise. Having standards might help to solidify positions. What follows is a very general review of positions taken, both pro and con.

Proponents are enthusiastic, even messianic about the prospects of standards. The standard bearers of enthusiasm promote the importance of bringing art into the center of learning communicating learning. The standards present the arts as a positive entry point for interdisciplinary learning, and as providing a model for assessment. (Down, 1993) They are also promoted as bringing the arts into the forefront of the education reform agenda. (Hausman, 1983) An NAEA Advisory gives the following synopsis:

1. Selecting and using visual arts media, techniques, and process to communicate ideas;

2. Using knowledge of sensory elements, organizational principles, expressive features, and functions of the visual arts to communicate ideas in visual terms and identify how these characteristics and structures are used in the visual art works of others;

3. Choosing and evaluating a range of subject matter, symbols, and ideas to be expressed in visual terms;

4. Understanding the visual arts in "relation" to history and cultures;

5. Reflecting upon, interpreting, analyzing, and critically assessing the characteristics, qualities, processes, and merits of their work and the work of others; and

6. Making connections between visual arts and other disciplines. (Hausman, 1994)

Achievement standards are sub divided into groups of standard grade groupings K-4, 5-8, 9-12 with corresponding levels of performance that increase with complexity as students develop and mature. Two levels, labeled proficient and advanced are proposed for the 9 - 12 group. No content is specified with the assumption that teachers and schools will make their own decisions in this area. Meeting standards will necessitate the inclusion of oral and written communication of art knowledge along with the visual. (Visual Arts Standards, 1994) The standards in reality are a very general framework on which a broad range of content and interest may hang.

It is unlikely that the standards will create anything close to national curriculum. First and foremost, they are voluntary. States may adopt national standards or they may write their own. It will be up to local schools, school boards and individual teachers to place anything in motion. (Dilger, 1995) Harlan Hoffa reminds us of just how persistent and individual the art crowd is and that it is unlikely that standardization will result from standards. (1994) A remarkable point to note is that consensus has been reached among the arts disciplines. (Hope, 1993) Whether or

not standards will move the variety of art forms towards a more central and collaborative focus remains to be seen.

Critics have their own flags to wave. Opposition centers on the need for continued work in research concerned that policy makers are working out of unproven assumptions, or promotional rhetoric that is political rather than educationally sound. Continued empirical research coupled with a stronger foundation in philosophy may be needed for continued support. There is from this point of view little in the way of hard evidence to show that the benefits advertised by the promoters will indeed be realized or that they benefit arts education. (Colwell, 1995) Many fear that the adoption of standards play to assessment and outcome practices that will formalize art into a sterile commodity and thereby remove it from the benefit of students.(Burton, 1994). Whether or not standards are published, it is in the practice of teaching that makes for good art education. Simplistic solutions on paper do not mean that these goals are nationally attainable when there is abundant evidence that fundamental ills of mass education have not been addressed (Ross, 1994). Perhaps the most articulate comment on standard setting comes from Maxine Greene, "To have standards in mind is to think in terms of what ought to be, to be responsive to feelings of obligatoriness, which we hope our students will come to share. Young people can learn from artist-teachers what it means to have a consciousness of craft, a desire for excellence or elegance or style. The crucial point is the free decision to adopt the artists' standards or norms, to incarnate them until they find their own." She further states, " We cannot reach toward the fixed standard; we must reach toward possibility". (1994, 399)

INTERDISCIPLINARY

We continually review and question the curriculum structure of our schools yet, much of that structure we cry out against is still firmly in place. (Blodgett, 1983) The expansion of curriculum content forces us to take an even harder look at what we will cover in a given course or offer in a four year high school sequence of courses. The need for additional courses in social issues, computers, college requirements and traditional course loads, all add to the burden of overloaded time slots. In art, deciding what to teach may involve leaving out more traditional

media as we consider how new technologies will be a part of our art offerings. Few of us have the resources to do it all. One possible avenue is through an interdisciplinary approach.

Independent schools have made limited forays into programs that link learning in one area to another but few seem to be truly integrated with many of these programs loosely coupled or based on short units or guest presentations. (NAIS, 1996 Database) True integrated learning where topics are netted together in a fabric that locks content into one learning frame is yet to be developed on any scale. Interdisciplinary curriculum planning is supported by the 1985 NAIS Arts Planning group. Several program approaches with varying levels of commitment and degree of integration are described and outlined in that document. (NAIS, 1985)

Curriculum integration may be approached from any number of possible points of involvement. The term interdisciplinary may be defined as "A knowledge view and curriculum approach that consciously applied methodology and language from more than one discipline to examine a central theme, issue, problem, topic or experience". (Jacobs, 1989) The degree to which this integration occurs varies from site to site, classroom to classroom A range of integrated approaches with terms such as "pluridisciplinary", "cross-disciplinary", and "multidisciplinary" to describe the layers of integration. (Hope, 1995, Jacobs, 1989) Administrative support, faculty interest, resources and above all flexible scheduling are dominant players in the success or failure of these programs. (Jacobs, 1989) Curriculum integration in the arts has its own additional concerns beyond those stated. There is integration within the arts themselves and then the larger fields of interdisciplinary study outside of the arts as they make connections with the sciences and humanities.

Those advocating the integration of art with other disciplines view this step as a way to strengthen the position of art and its place within the core of learning. (Dunn, 1995) (Sikes, 1995) Advocates further seek to demonstrate that "the arts always have meaning beyond themselves, that they function in a system of cultural belief,". (Anderson, 1995) DBAE writers encourage interdisciplinary approaches that connect the arts and bring them together with other academic disciplines. (Amdur, 1993) National Standards promote the arts as a primary force for bringing focus to interdisciplinary study. (Down, 1993) The IB program offers opportunities to approach learning in the arts with an interdisciplinary focus that encompases a world view. The research

portion of the art and design program of IB is particularly well suited for integrated learning experiences. Arts PROPEL offers additional support for integrated learning.

Although the arts may be viewed by some as having a central place in learning, many arts teachers will find the balance difficult as some of that teaching is transferred to other departments. (Donmoyer, 1995) We are warned against a rush for integration for fear that the arts will lose sight of their own mission and integrity, swallowed up by other subject areas. (Roucher, Lovano-Kerr, 1995) (Smith, 1995) In the rush to embrace these program initiatives, we are further warned that much of what might be called interdisciplinary lacks honesty in promoting knowledge and skills. (Hope, 1995)

The College Board in collaboration with GCEA has recently initiated a program to study the role of the arts in a unified curriculum. Five high schools have been selected from a field of 200 applicants as pilot locations. In the belief that the high school curriculum remains seriously fragmented, the arts are seen as a possible linking point for cross-disciplinary work and integration. Directors of this program are optimistic that the project will serve as a catalyst for change. The project intends to develop and test model programs with periodic review, updates and institutes. The College Board has also established The National Center for Cross-Disciplinary Teaching and Learning.

THE NATIONAL ART EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

The NAEA does not promote curriculum programs nor does it have a specific program of study adopted as its own. It does serve as a forum for a range of programs and research designed to promote art education. The NAEA was a partner in the development of National Standards in the Arts but also welcomes critical evaluation on that as well as all other issues. National and locally sponsored conferences have invited sessions from all sides of the debate on the the issues that are a part of this study. Articles , supporting or critical of any or all of the issues discussed in this study and other programs are regularly published by NAEA.

SURVEY

PURPOSE

The purpose of the survey was to gather information on decision making practices in visual art curriculum in independent schools. It is proposed to develop a sketch rather than a finished picture. General information was collected as a starting point for additional discussion. Additionally, the survey sought to ascertain to what extent national programs and reform initiatives in the visual arts discussed earlier in the study influence or fail to influence curriculum decisions. The study intends to provide an overview with additional follow up studies suggested through findings that might provide a deeper understanding of both decision making and possible influences. The investigation is not intended to evaluate either the programs selected, teaching practices or the schools themselves.

SCHOOL SELECTION

For the purpose of the survey, an average and random selection of schools was desirable. An initial list of schools was taken from The Handbook of Private Schools, published by Porter Sargent. It was important not to select schools known to have a particular approach nor to specifically select those schools with exemplary programs. No geographic focus was intended or desired, therefore the original list consisted of a national range of schools. All geographic areas were included. In that a concentration of independent schools occurs in particular regions, those regions are more heavily represented with the majority of schools east of the Mississippi and of those, the greater number remain in the northeast sector.

School selection was established to provide a survey population that included secondary level education and those schools claiming art as part of the program of study. The focus of the study is on secondary art experiences, therefore the original school list needed to provide schools that include grades 9 - 12. Institutions having exclusively elementary or middle school grades were not included. Schools were included that served K - 12 populations with many

falling into the 9 - 12 range.

School selection was limited to those institutions with a student population of 250 or over. An assumption was made here that smaller schools would be less likely to have more than one art teacher and that in many cases this person might be part time. Given the small size of many independent schools, 250 seemed a reasonable number and provide an average view, typical of a broad range of school types.

An additional qualification was imposed in searching for schools that listed art as either an academic component or as a curriculum feature entry in the Handbook of Private Schools. It was important to survey schools that include visual arts, making it a part of the course of study. It is unknown how schools determine the listing in this publication. It cannot be assumed that schools not listing art in these brief descriptors, place less emphasis on this area and no attempt was made in the survey to ascertain that information. Neither was any attempt made to use, or not use those schools having highly regarded art programs. The survey did not ask for specific information on teachers nor did it determine who filled out the survey. Surveys were directed to art department heads. For the purpose of the study, it was decided to maintain an overview that was as average and national as possible. These schools serve only as a representative population of the independent sector.

The initial search described above resulted in a list of 400 schools. The number was reduced further by selecting every third school on that list , resulting in a final list of 125. Selection thus insured that all geographic areas would be represented . No other limitations were imposed. Fifty eight surveys were returned for a response rate of 46%.

SURVEY RETURNS

Geographic distribution described follows the sequence of schools in the Porter Sargent Handbook Series. Twenty eight responses came from schools in the northeast sector, fourteen returns from the southeast, seven from Midwestern states, and six from the far west. Three returned surveys but did not return an address form. A map illustrating geographic distribution of responses in included in the appendix along with a list of participating schools. A range of

school types is also represented , day, boarding, coed, and single sex. Schools returning surveys, types and enrollment are listed in the appendix.

SURVEY QUESTIONS

Eight questions were included in the survey. A copy of the survey in the original form is included in the appendix. Each of the eight questions asked had a range of possible choices and respondents were asked to select all that might apply in their school setting. Knowing that each teacher and each situation might have its own unique approach, a comment space was added for any clarification that the respondent might care to indicate.

Programs for the survey questions were selected as they all have a national or international constituency and therefore the possibility of wide influence. All are well established with some generating a considerable literature base in research or experience. The literature of each of these programs or topics has been surveyed in another section of this study. Other programs might have been included, but it is felt that this list consists of those programs with higher profiles and broad areas of acceptance. Some have generated controversy and national discussion both within and without the art education community. Questions were formulated to ascertain not what is taught but how decisions are arrived at and to what degree national initiatives influence, or fail to influence that decision making process.

RESPONSE RESULTS

What follows is a summary of the responses received for each statement or question asked, with comments offered by those returning that information. Limiting choices in independent schools where autonomy is prized may have been troubling to several respondents. The uniqueness and independence of teaching situations in the visual arts indicates that the broadest possible range of choices would need to be generated to include all situations. Responses are reported in percentages. Responses of 5 or less are not reported as percentages. Questions and possible choices are included below.

1. Who decides what should be taught in visual arts courses?

A. I make all decisions for my own courses.

B. Decisions are made by department consensus.

C. Decisions are made by the department chair

D. All course decisions are made by other administrators.

E. Decisions are arrived at collaboratively with visual arts faculty, the department chair, or other administrators.

Responses

The great majority of responses , 62 %, indicated that individual teachers make all decisions for courses with 19 % indicating additional collaboration. 42% indicated that they and they alone made decisions. 12% reported some departmental consensus with 6% indicating consensus as the only choice. Very few reported decisions made primarily by department chairs or other administrators. Collaborative decision making among faculty, administration and department chairs was reported by 36 % with 24% indicating this as the primary process.

Commentary Responses

A number of comments reinforced the independence of individual teachers in making decisions, some mentioned being the only art teacher. It was also mentioned that where a foundations course is in place, agreement on the nature of that course was discussed or arrived at through consensus. It was also pointed out that student demand plays a role along with difficulties in scheduling. Little discussion seems to take place across, faculty, departmental and administration lines with any collaborative decisions remaining within the department. Respondents indicated that approval from other administrators occurs when departmental consensus cannot be reached or that this approval is perfunctory.

2. How is credit awarded for visual arts courses?

A. Elective only , no credit assigned.

B. Elective with limited credit.

C. Full credit as an academic discipline.

D. Limited academic credit.

E. AP art courses are given academic credit.

Responses

No response indicated a situation of elective only, with no credit assigned. The largest percentage 83% indicated full credit as an academic discipline, 67% had this as the only choice. 19% reported AP courses as having academic credit. 10% reported elective with limited credit.

Commentary Responses

Comments revealed support for course credit with time invested being a factor in those decisions. Mentioned were additional course loading to fit art in, less time allowed for art and therefore less credit. It was also mentioned that considerable documentation was required for credit approval. AP courses seemed more likely to receive full academic credit. Comments also indicated courses not being weighted.

3. How do visual arts courses relate to other academic disciplines?

A. All courses, visual arts included, are separate and distinct.

B. We have a highly integrated inter-disciplinary program.

C. The visual arts are integrated in a limited way in other departments.

D. Visual arts faculty initiate curriculum integration.

Responses

45% state that all courses are predominately separate and distinct, while 31% indicated this as the only response. 43% stated the arts as being integrated to a limited extent with 34% stating this as the only response. No responses indicated a highly integrated approach. Visual arts faculty were said to initiate integration by 29% of the responses with 16% indicating this as the only response.

Commentary Responses

Comment responses indicate that although most courses remain separate, what limited integration of course material occurs or inter-disciplinary work, is done in distinct units with much of this exchange initiated by the arts faculty. The importance of a positive and natural exchange of information is noted along the lines of faculty interests in specific topics. It was also mentioned that integration of ideas is alive and well in the early years but diminishes at the secondary level. Limited exchange of information happens in the form of slide borrowing by other academic programs. Some cross-disciplinary work is indicated among the arts or team teaching within the department.

4. The following programs have influenced curriculum planning in visual arts.

A. Advanced Placement Program of The College Board.

B. International Baccalaureate

C. National Standards in the Visual Arts

D. Arts Propel

E. The Getty Discipline Based Arts Education Program.

F. Portfolio Assessment Initiatives

G. National Art Education Association

Responses

The largest percentage 57% stated having been influenced by the AP program. The next largest group , 33% indicated influences from DBAE, with 31% indicting NAEA. National Standards garnered 26% with very few responses on Arts PROPEL. 21% stated no influence.

Commentary Responses

The traditional art school model and personal background experience were noted most often in the comments as major factors, or the only influence. In addition to the programs listed as choices, state guidelines, and attendance at NAEA conferences, were noted as other sources.

Also mentioned were differing influences in elementary, middle and upper school program needs.

5. We participate in the following programs:

A. Advanced Placement Portfolio Exams of The College Board.

B. International Baccalaureate

C. National Standards in the Visual Arts

D. Arts Propel

E. Getty Discipline Based Arts Education

F. Portfolio Assessment

Responses

The greater percentage of responses, 60 % indicated participation in the AP program with 43% indicating that as the only response. 33% stated no participation in choices. Portfolio assessment was 19% while no respondent selected Arts PROPEL. 1 B and National Standards had very few respondents indicting participation.

Commentary Responses

Respondent comments focused on the AP program. Comments here ranged from getting information, full participation and students doing well to a lack of interest or difficulties with validity. Time constraints along with difficulties in getting students interested were also mentioned.

6. Visual arts faculty have participated in programs/workshops that offer training in:

A. Advanced Placement, The College Board.

B. International Baccalaureate Program

C. National Standards in the Visual Arts

D. Arts Propel

E. Getty Discipline Based Art Education.

F. Portfolio Assessment.

Responses

Participation in AP workshops was reported by 48% of respondents. 28% indicated AP training as the only choice. 41% responded with having no training in any of the programs. 21% selected portfolio assessment with an equal percentage designating DBAE. 12% indicate participation in National Standards programs or workshops.

Commentary Responses

The majority of comments referred to other forms of development that included access to local or regional institutional offerings, or reflective practices within individual school settings. Also mentioned were difficulties in funding for attendance at outside training programs and conferences. Some commented on a lack of interest or the viability of programs, while others mentioned long experience with specific programs and high involvement.

7. How are students evaluated in visual arts courses?

A. Each faculty member determines criteria for student evaluation.

B. The department designs assessment criteria collaboratively .

C. There is no formal grading or assessment of students in the visual arts.

D. Portfolio review is part of our assessment.

E. Portfolio review is the major method of assessing achievement.

Response

The majority of responses, 76 % indicated that each faculty member determine individual criteria for student evaluation with 34% indicating that as the only method. 40% indicated the use of a portfolio review process while 38% also reported designing criteria collaboratively. No respondent indicated that student learning in art was not graded formally.

Commentary Response

This section elicited more comments than any other. Comments were directed towards the very specific means that teachers and departments used for evaluation. Mentioned were the use of written tests, gallery assessments and reviews, self evaluation on the part of students and much support for the critique method. Portfolio review was indicated frequently as an important part of the evaluation. Having the whole department together on these issues was also noted along with procedures.

8. In selecting additional faculty, the art department prefers

A. Professionally trained artists in specific media.

B. Teachers knowledgeable about national efforts in arts education.

C. Teachers with both: a professional art background, and knowledge of national efforts in arts education.

Responses

The majority of responses preferred teachers with both a professional art background and knowledge in art education issues and programs, 66%. 34% placed an emphasis on the professional working artist model with expertise in specific media.

Commentary Responses

Comments for this section most often brought out relating to students, seeing their needs and being able to do so through a professional lens. The importance of professional skills as working artists was a prominent theme although many commented on the need for broad experience in media and flexibility in teaching more than one level.

TELEPHONE INTERVIEWS

Twenty one schools were surveyed in telephone interviews. Schools were selected by geographic region to maintain a similar national and average view as in the larger mail survey. A list of schools participating is included in the appendix. The person to whom the interview was directed was that individual who returned the survey. The purpose of these interviews was to gain a more personal view of art programming in schools beyond what a survey form could collect. Everyone contacted was more than generous with time and information, anxious to share programs and goals.

The protocol of the interviews was informal. Participants were asked to elaborate on the decision making process in place, influences and models that have impacted decisions in programming and content. Information on the level of involvement in programs listed in the study and the influence of those programs in decision making was also discussed. Additional information was solicited on interdisciplinary programs and to what extent those initiatives were developed out of personal interest or through departmental and administrative direction.

Many participants indicated that they and they alone made content decisions in the classroom. Most were enthusiastic about this process voicing pleasure in being able to set their own directions. The freedom to change the program at will and with little consultation was heard over and again. Some saw this independence as a high priority indicating that even in schools where more than one person constituted an art staff, the independence of the individual teacher was paramount. Participants described themselves most often as artists and teachers with focus in media. Many indicted that their own area of expertise in painting, photography, graphic arts or architecture had a strong influence. Even in schools where general collaboration seemed to exist, the autonomy of teacher decision in specific content seemed to prevail. Administrators beyond department chairs were generally viewed as not involved in content decisions.

The most enthusiastic conversations came from those teachers that were department chairs with departments where collaboration and shared programming were in place. Although the majority of individual teachers made specific content decisions, a number of respondents indicated overall planning included the entire department. Where collaboration had developed, influences

beyond the individual were indicated. An advantage was seen in having many voices and backgrounds part of the planning process. In two interviews, it was stated that total autonomy prevailed and that very different philosophies were in place based on the individual preference of faculty. In one instance, two upper level instructors had little or no contact, while in the second, divisions of lower, middle and upper schools were an additional dividing factor.

Department chairs indicated a communication line to the administrative level but generally indicated that this was for the most part a formality. Only in situations where external factors such as scheduling or major course changes occurred did administrative structures become involved. Administrators were described as not really interested or trusting and fully confident that the art program did not need their attention. Administrators supported art programs in funding but very little interest in art curriculum development or pedagogy was indicated. Four interviews pointed out administrative involvement. In one, a new head of school whose background included work in the coalition school movement of Ted Sizer was seen as having a strong interest in working with the arts in collaborative teaching and portfolio assessment. Another indicated strong support in working with the faculty by bringing in outside consultants. The department chair saw this as a very positive move. In a third school, the initiative came directly from the administration in hiring an arts coordinator to oversee all of the arts. Overall school curriculum included the arts where a staff development focus on cooperative learning included the arts in new models for teaching. This initiative prompted the department to consider additional issues such as non-Western materials. Another teacher described her own work in bringing to the school head a carefully articulated overview of the art program, initiatives and goals.

Where a single individual taught visual arts, that individual seemed to be more dependent on their own background and training with little outside influence. Many single teachers were autonomous in all decision making with a strong personal investment in studio practice. One respondent indicated the importance of the spirit of the artist involved in work to serve as an authentic model. The prevailing model was the art school studio. Very few of these teachers indicated any outside influences as having made an impact. A cursory familiarity with programs included in the study was mentioned from time to time but very little in-depth information seemed to hold much interest. Many of these teachers mentioned that their own interests were a primary

source of curriculum decisions. Participation in workshops or summer programs came from personal interest. Very little initiation seemed forthcoming from administration but most teachers said that they would be given some funding to attend programs if requested.

In larger departments, more information seemed to be generated from many sources outside the school. A number of department chairs mentioned a variety of programs, conferences, and workshops that faculty had participated in. Although few indicated the adoption of any single program that determined curriculum direction, a number of interviews indicated some familiarity with those programs in the survey. Many indicated that a broad reading of information had made some changes over past years.

Although no school interviewed had fully adopted the DBAE approach, conversations showed that the curriculum had moved to the inclusion of art history, criticism and aesthetics within strong studio practice. Much of this was informal and casual with some references to writing as part of that experience. Many talked of field trips to local galleries and museums in answer to the question of how an art history or aesthetics component was included. One school studied aesthetics and philosophy as part of a senior seminar. There was very little response in reference to the study of criticism as a formal discipline. Student and teacher critique were mentioned frequently. Three respondents had studies DBAE and were carefully considering moves to a more structured frame. Most of those interviewed had done little in depth reading. One teacher indicated contact with GCEA via the interney and the preparation of a video for the board that emphasized learning in the DBAE domains.

The AP program was mentioned as having had influence in how programs were structured. A number of respondents spoke of the need for preparation prior to an AP level experience and that this determined course content to some extent. A number of interviews yielded strong participation in workshops while one participant was an AP faculty consultant. Some felt that AP restricted programming and that the individuality and strength of the art experience at that particular school went beyond an AP portfolio experience. Two respondents had attended workshops out of a need for more information and indicated positive influences from that experience. Four respondents associated the AP program with competitions or regarded it as a test to teach to. It was also mentioned that the work developed in this program was used as part of student

presentations for college admissions regardless of whether or not they planned to major in art.

National Standards were mentioned infrequently as being either investigated or employed. Very few had sought out this information and none was delivered by way of the administration. Two respondents had made a definite study of standards and were using them as a base on which to build their own. State guidelines were also mentioned in two interviews as having had some influence in formulating goals and objectives.

One of the schools called was an IB school. Even though there is a definite design to the IB curriculum, teacher autonomy was firmly in place here as well. Three teachers with very different teaching styles guide students through this program. Teachers participated in IB workshops and were fully informed on that process.

Out of the twenty one schools contacted, two indicated knowledge of ARTS PROPEL. One of these had made a study of the program using the process portfolio approach. The second had some information but there was little indication that an in-depth study had been undertaken. Most interviews yielded little information on ARTS PROPEL and many had never heard of it. Evaluation was reported as being determined by individual teachers. Little in the way of a collaborative methodology or systems approach seemed to be in place. Informal portfolio grading dominated responses. A number of teachers mentioned written work as part of the studio program and as part of the evaluative procedure. Most respondents reported working out an evaluation program with a primary focus on the end result. Sketchbooks were included in evaluations and discussed as important teaching tools.

Interdisciplinary programs were found to be minimal and generally limited to the occasional guest lecture. Most described their schools as having a traditional curriculum with clear divisions between departments. In a number of interviews participants indicated that they or other art teachers provided slides, posters or information to colleagues. Programs of shared learning between disciplines seemed absent. Very little support was indicated from administrations to develop programs with time and scheduling mentioned as primary blocks. Frequently mentioned were short cooperative ventures between two teachers that just happened to be interested in the same subject or saw a convenient connection between disciplines and teaching methods. In almost all cases, it was the art teacher who was providing visual information illustrative of content for

another discipline. One department was hesitant to be involved in cross disciplinary teaching and felt that art would end up as the "step child". Interviews indicated a greater interest in collaborative programs in lower school, limited interest at the middle school level, and very little in high school. Two mentioned administrative interest. Both of these were new heads arriving from recent experiences where this was in practice or had contact with programs in place.

Interdisciplinary learning within the arts was mentioned in a number of interviews. Integration and collaboration were frequently indicated as part of the lower school program. Very little was apparent in upper school experiences. Two types of programming were mentioned, appreciation courses dedicated to all the arts or performance programs where the visual arts were included as set design, prop making and poster design.

Planning curriculum that involves a written document was not mentioned very often. Those schools where a strong departmental structure with collaborative efforts seemed to be in place also indicated that scope and sequence were important. During four interviews, considerable time was taken to explain a process of collaboration and the effort that had gone into working out a sequential curriculum for an entire school. Many indicated a curriculum of great fluidity, a loosely coupled department structure and change from year to year with the teacher as the deciding factor. Past and present practice had generally not been recorded. One responded was happy to be free of the lesson plan. During the course of conversation, other influences were mentioned as having had an impact on teaching styles and curriculum development. Textbooks and individuals provided frames of reference. Mentioned were current texts, Living with Art, Emphasis Art, and Art Talk. The presence of a strong mentor was suggested as having had a profound influence on the methodology of one teacher. Elliot Eisner was also mentioned as an influence. Attendance at NAEA or state conferences came up during four sessions as being a source of ideas and resources while three teachers also mentioned local groups of independent art teachers as an important network for support and the exchange of information.

Responses to questions of faculty and the hiring of additional staff clearly expressed interest in persons with a strong studio base. Expertise in media, and demonstrated skill as a practicing artist was a prevailing interest. Repeatedly the idea of an authentic model of performance was stressed. Being an artist however, was not enough. The combination of artist /

performance was stressed. Being an artist however, was not enough. The combination of artist / teacher was highly regarded in the minds of those interviewed. The needs of students were indicated as foremost and in most instances the person hired needed to be skilled as a teacher with demonstrated sensitivity to student needs. This was generally viewed as a personality or intuitive given. Training, as an art teacher was mentioned less often.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Choice remains at the heart of teaching art in the independent school community. It echoes loud and clear as an issue of the utmost importance to teachers. Time and again the freedom to choose was foremost in both the comments included in the survey and in discussions held over the phone. Setting an individual program of study is held as a badge of honor, a right. Most found it a great privilege to teach in an environment that supports and indeed promotes autonomy. There is little danger that art teachers will begin to formulate any kind of program based on rigid standards, nor will they adhere to others notions of what ought to be going on their studios and classrooms. The population in this study was despite minor complaints very happily situated. Many reported long years of service with little indication that they would be leaving the profession anytime soon. It was interesting to note how many of those I talked with by telephone had been at the same institution for over ten years. In reviewing data from the survey and from telephone conversations, I found dedication, commitment and enthusiasm. A sense of mission is evident. I talked to a confident and articulate group of art teachers with a very high level of expert information eager to deliver an outstanding visual arts program.

Information gathered indicates dependence on the individual teacher as the primary source of information in setting goals, initiating programs and communicating beyond the classroom. Even in departments where conversations take place, little seems to transpire in the way of concurrent course planning or a sequential curriculum design. Many decisions seem to develop out

of time, circumstance and the personal interests of the instructor rather than out of design. Few department chairs saw long range curriculum decisions as a major responsibility. Department chairs remarked that it was often necessary to convince other members of their departments to work together on firm plans in curriculum design, or consider new approaches. Very few questions were being asked about specific course content. As long as a strong faculty remains in place the program is likely to remain strong. Without a framework that new faculty can work within, the program is open to dramatic changes in direction.

It follows that student evaluations were found to be independently arrived at by individual teachers, again with minimal discussion of alternative practice on the part of whole departments. The art school studio model appears firmly in place with personalized critique as a major form of student assessment. Students are thus likely to receive considerable attention individually tailored to independent learning. This might also lead to an evaluative program that is unstable and lacks credibility. Grades may be difficult to predict for students making a somewhat unstable relationship between achievement and evaluation from one course to another .Discussion with those outside of the deparment, academic deans, and curriculum coordinators might give added weight to learning in art.

Communicating the design of programs and resulting learning outcomes appear heavily weighted on producing tangible evidence in the form of art work. There was a marked absence of conversation on collaborative work with administrators beyond the department chair. The view of the department was that administrators had little information on which to enter the conversation and seemed willing to maintain a laissez faire attitude. Although programs like AP and DBAE have been around for a long time, the study indicates that they have had some impact. Any influence appears to be limited to a few schools where art teachers have searched out information. Independent art programs do not appear to look very far beyond themselves. This does not imply that decisions are made in a vacuum but rather that very individualized avenues are being pursued. Much of this information may be shared, but within a small circle.

Administrators were mentioned as sources of funding and facilities, but rarely cast in the role of educational leadership in the arts. Additional research focused on the views of administrators would supply an additional and perhaps quite different view. Although art

programs are often highly visible in gallery and hall exhibits, the assumption that learning must be taking place seems to follow as a given. Very few administrators are asking specific questions about what is being learned and depend on the visual arts faculty to inform them. Discussion and dialogue does not seem to take place very often.

It was apparent that very few hard questions related to learning, assessment and curriculum are being asked by either teachers or administrators. How do we know that students are learning? What are they learning ? Art teaching appears to be rolling along on the basis of what is assumed to work. Another question to ask from an administrative viewpoint would be to ascertain how art programs are evaluated. Only one telephone response indicated that an objective examination and review of curriculum structure and content had been undertaken to answer questions.

Arts teachers may be empowered as few other faculty to make decisions and carry out learning programs of their own design. This would indicates that hiring does more than fill a position. Hiring determines course content, curriculum design and student evaluation. It also could mean that a change in faculty could effect major curriculum changes.

It is evident that art has developed a strong presence in many independent schools. I heard very little of the laments of budget cutting and program elimination that so frequently punctuates art teacher conversations in the public sector. The visual arts have become an integral part of the independent landscape. If art programs are valued as part of a program of study, they should also be carefully examined from time to time and pushed to grow. Assumptions need to be tested and questioned if real growth is to occur. Growth does not necessarily mean expansion in the form of new buildings or added courses. It can also mean reflective practice. Collaborative planning may strengthen the place of art through continuity and stability that is less dependent on personal and therefore possibly idiosyncratic choices. Decisions made that involves the larger community based on research and external information may help to maintain healthy dynamic programs.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following annotated bibliography divides each of the separate topics into a distinct listing. Within some listings, articles have been further subdivided into supportive and critical writers. In some cases articles have dealt with more than one of the programs. In that case articles are listed in each of the categories.

DISCIPLINE BASED ART EDUCATION

Writers included in the first part of this annotated list, advocate the DBAE approach to art education. Included in this group are those involved in early development, implementation and continued evaluation of DBAE as it has evolved since its inception. Historical, philosophical and practical guides are considered from a supportive community of arts education professionals. Some are reflective, noting changes and adaptations encountered as theory has met practice, others, seek to defend critical views developed over the course of implementation.

Amdur, D. (1993). Arts and Cultural Context, A Curriculum Integrating Discipline-Based Art Education with Other Humanities Subjects at the Secondary Level. *Art Education*, 46, (3), 12-19.

Promotes interrelationship in learning, bringing art in as a connecting web and cautions against the formalist approach to teaching art as an isolating factor. DBAE is promoted as central in making those connections through inquiry that is contextual. Amdur suggests that an integrated curriculum would make learning more accessible to a variety of styles. An emphasis on intellectual inquiry with a thematic approach is proposed based in part on the interdisciplinary design of Heidi Hayes Jacobs (1989). Included is a sample curriculum unit based on the study of prehistory.

Brigham, D. (1988) Doing DBAE Differently to Achieve its Primary Goal. In Burton, J. M., & Lederman, A., & London, P., (Eds.) (1988). Beyond DBAE: The Case for Multiple Visions of Art. University Council on Art Education.

The implementation of a verbal based curriculum for visual arts is seen as flawed creating a dilemma. The author proposes to extend the ideas of DBAE through an approach that is rich with objects and tangible materials. Slides and reproductions could then be used for direct engagement with works of art. A sample lesson is included on expression through color using slides of major works of art.

Broudy, H.S. (1990). DBAE: Complaints, Reminiscences, and Response. *Educational Theory*, 40, (4), 431-435.

Broudy describes his own search for a language that enables a non artist population to find common ground for analysis of works of art. The resulting method "scanning" is described as it becomes part of the Getty Institute program. Broudy describes the origins of DBAE, with a brief critical discussion of the more usual pattern of instruction in art and the challenges that DBAE offers. The major shifts proposed by DBAE are in the assumption that classroom teachers could take on the responsibility of arts education and that activities derived from studio practice would shift to aesthetics, art history, and art criticism.

Clark, G.A. & M. D. Day, & W.D. Greer (1987) Discipline-based Art Education: Becoming Students of Art. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 21, (2), 129-193.

This article details the approach of DBAE first by comparing it to other movements. Charts outline the ideas for clarification. Characteristics of a DBAE approach are carefully outlined and explained in detail. The four disciplines are outlined in brief as part of the outline of characteristics. The program outline presented is a major source of information on DBAE.

Crawford, D. (1987) Aesthetics in Discipline-based Art Education. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 21, (2), 227-239.

Aesthetics is seen as an important component of a fully developed art curriculum. Despite its philosophical base it can be taught at every level beginning with the primary years. The study of aesthetics as a distinct discipline is viewed as part of a general education in that it presents another form of inquiry. The place of aesthetics in DBAE is outlined.

Day, M.D. (1985). Evaluating Student Achievement in Discipline-Based Art Programs. *Studies in Art Education*, 26, (4), 232-240.

Evaluation is an essential component of the DBAE approach. Knowledge that is acquired can be assessed in ways that are similar to other disciplines. Day characterizes art education up to this point in time as having an emphasis on personal growth where the evaluation of art products is the primary form of assessment. Day articulates each of the domains of DBAE suggesting practical evaluative procedures.

Day, M.D. (1987). Discipline-Based Art Education in Secondary Classrooms. *Studies in Art Education*, 28, (4), 235-241.

Day reports on early indications of success in applying the DBAE model to secondary practice. The author points to a number of studies in supporting a claim of positive outcomes and describes a lesson unit on cubism based on the DBAE approach. A series of practical questions are posed with supporting answers.

Day, M.D. (1989). The Characteristics, Benefits, and Problems Associated With Implementing DBAE. *NAASP Bulletin*, 73, (517), 43-52.

Two hypothetical principals visit a fully developed K - 12 program to investigate the implementation of DBAE. In the comprehensive school described, art is valued as essential for all students and required for graduation. As the visitors move through the school, discussion and questions focus on practical issues of budget, curriculum offerings, academics, staffing and evaluation.

Day, M.D. & Kay Alexander. (1991). Discipline Based Art Education: A Curriculum Sampler. Santa Monica, CA: The Getty Center for Education in the Arts.

Published by the Getty Center for Education in the Arts, this series of teacher written lessons can be adapted and expanded to provide for individual teaching situations and varying grade levels. It is written not as a ready made curriculum package but developed in the hope that it would serve as a model to stimulate additional innovations. Content is divided into broad themes such as experiencing works in a museum, spaces and places, and the people in our lives.

DiBlasio, M.K. (1985). Continuing the Tradition: Further Delineation of the DBAE Format. *Studies in Art Education*. 26, (4). 197-205.

A strong proponent of DBAE, the author carefully reviews and clarifies early efforts influencing the eventual development of DBAE. She cites the importance of linkages between concepts, theories, and principles. Sequential management of concepts is seen as essential in learning with ever increasing complexities. The difficulties of dealing with the shifting boundaries of aesthetics are discussed and problems presented as the idea of professional modeling in the four domains is developed. It is suggested that through metaphor, the four disciplines are integrated.

DiBlasio, M.K. (1987). Reflections on the Theory of Discipline-Based Art Education. *Studies in Art Education*, 28, (4), 221-226.

The author warns that the popularization and simplification of loosely held notions of DBAE may diminish its theoretical base and devalue its effectiveness. Important underlying concepts such as the interdependent integrity of the four disciplines linked systematically in sequence is essential to success. Although the theory can accommodate local needs, adopting a generalized patchwork of the theory will trivialize the core.

Dobbs, S.M. (1989). Discipline-Based Art Education: Some Questions and Answers. *NAASP Bulletin*, 73, (517), 7-13.

As senior program officer of The Getty Center for Education in the Arts, Dobbs supports DBAE in that art should be located within the general curriculum as it teaches about culture and civilization. It also teaches communication and understanding in a non-verbal format, creativity, problem solving, choice, and critical thinking.

Duke, L.L. (1984). The Getty Center for Education in the Arts. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 65, (9), 612-614.

As director of the center, Duke outlines programs in place as of 1984 reviewing current status , evaluative features and plans for the future. Programs of particular note and importance are training institutes for elementary teachers and their principals and seminars for superintendents and school board members. The program lends support not only to teaching practice but to the culture in which that activity may flourish.

Dukë, L.L. (1988). The Getty Center for Education in the Arts and Discipline-Based Art Education. *Art Education*, 41, (2) 7-12.

Duke provides a five year report on DBAE with a brief historical overview of the establishment of the Getty Center and its adoption of the ideas inherent in a discipline focus for art education. An account of the early survey conducted by the Rand Corporation is mentioned as the information base for existing practice. Development of the theory, curriculum, model programs and the professional training of teachers are reviewed.

Efland, A. D. (1987) Curriculum Antecedents of Discipline-based Art Education. *Journal of Aesthetic Education.*, 21, (2), 57-93.

Efland provides a detailed view of the earliest beginnings of the ideas inherent in the DBAE

approach. Each of the early programs are reviewed with reference to historical contexts. Important contributors are credited along with roles played in the development of art education as a research based discipline.

Eisner, E.W. (1987). The Role of Discipline-Based Art Education in America's Schools. *Art Education*. 40, (5), 6-45.

Eisner develops a rational and responsible approach as to why art is fundamental to the whole educational process. The marginal status of art in schools is reviewed with the lack of rigorous assessment seen as a major impediment for serious consideration. The purely developmental approach is seen as limiting learning to what arises from inside the student. What DBAE has to offer is described based on assumptions in meaning and development that is both exterior and interior. Each of the four learning components of DBAE are highlighted while curriculum structures are suggested to provide for goals to be achieved in practice. To make this work, paradigm shifts in teaching and resources will need to be provided for. The importance of the written curriculum and evaluation is stressed.

Eisner, E. W. (1990). Discipline-Based Art Education: Conceptions and Misconceptions. *Educational Theory*, 40, (2), 423-430.

A brief review of the history and background of the ideas of DBAE prior to Getty and the role the Getty Foundation played in bringing those ideas to the forefront of thinking and practice in visual arts education. A critical evaluation of the views of David Arnstine follows based on the structure of his paper, also reviewed in this document. Particular attention is paid to criticisms that reference academic study vs. studio practice, popular culture vs. masterpieces, and the use of non-western cultures as a major focus of DBAE. Eisner states clearly that DBAE is inclusive with cognition as its base promoting an educational course of study with substance and depth.

Gentile, J. R. & N. C. Murnyack. (1989). How Shall Students Be Graded in Discipline-Based Art Education. *Art Education*, 42, (6), 33-41.

Authors suggest a positive grading scheme for student works of art that embraces all four disciplines of DBAE while addressing approaches that are both norm and criterion-referenced. For each of the four disciplines, guidelines are suggested with emphasis on criteria-referenced evaluation. DBAE is approached as positive, leading to a more structured framework for fair and equitable evaluation that eliminates former

attitudes that art cannot be graded or that grades in art will need to fall into the same guidelines used in other disciplines thereby disregarding arts unique contribution

Greer, W.D. (1987). A Structure of Discipline Concepts for DBAE. *Studies in Art Education.* 28, (4), 227-233.

The essential characteristics of a DBAE program of study are outlined briefly along with a diagram featuring content and inquiry concepts for each of the four areas. Both content and inquiry are explained in each of the discipline areas. It is suggested that the framework established be used to test curriculum claims.

Greer, W. D. (1992). Harry Broudy and Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE). *Journal of Aesthetic Education,* 26, (4), 49-60.

Traces the theoretical background and early ideas leading to later developments, particularly with reference to the seminal work of Broudy as a philosopher and also as an inspiring teacher. Contributions of Broudy and his influence on the early development of DBAE are acknowledged.

Greer, W. D. (1993). Developments in Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE): From Art Education Toward Arts Education. *Studies in Art Education,* 34, (2), 91-101.

Greer highlights the development of ideas, evaluations, and criticisms referencing writers both pro and con. Included is a review of positions taken by these writers that updates their thinking to 1993. Developments specific to the four discipline areas are also reviewed. Evidence of the expansion of DBAE ideas into other fields, most particularly other arts disciplines is suggested as evidence for beginning to bring the study of all art forms together under a common banner.

Kindler, A. (1992) Discipline Based Art Education in Secondary Schools: a Possible Approach. *Journal of Art & Design Education,* 11, (3), 345-355.

This author discusses a rationale for new curriculum based on the ideas of DBAE and suggests that a variety of options be considered by teachers for solutions that best fit their own situations. Proposes a model curriculum as an elective course for juniors and seniors offered concurrently with a studio experience. One problem is the matter of cutting into the time of a studio course, in this case the studio course is one semester, The author does not want to neglect studio and so the solution here is a separate course. A theory based

course might be more attractive to those students who find the risks inherent in a studio base more than they can deal with. It also has the added goal of assisting the support of administration in gaining required graduation credits. Course content is described as elements of art history and appreciation with an emphasis on intelligent criticism. The course is not chronological but based on specific issues with the first part devoted to criticism, cultural context and formal qualities. The second part of the course is devoted to lectures that demonstrate techniques in two and three dimensional art, architecture, photography and computer graphics. A final phase includes a museum experience. Learning is class room based using slides, video, discussion, writing and reading assignments. Emphasis is placed on developments in contemporary art.

Kleinbauer, W.E. (1987). Art History in Discipline-based Art Education, *Journal of Aesthetic Education,* 21, (2), 205-215.

This author argues for the importance of the study of art history beginning with primary grades and for inclusion as a distinct discipline at the high school level. Provides a rationale for the study of art history as one of the four domains of DBAE.

MacGregor, R. N. (1992). DBAE: At The Secondary Level: Compounding Primary Gains. *NAASP Bulletin,* 73, (517), 23-29.

Education has provided the opportunity for children to do art and to make choices about materials, their selection and use. DBAE is introduced and a system with sequence is put into place. The author objects to how art is generally taught in elementary grades as lacking structure, with activities based on the interests and abilities of teachers. Levels of skill, experiences and learning are barely distinguishable from grade level to grade level. Transferring DBAE to high school may be easier in that content is considered to have greater value at this level. The need for adjustment in the high school schedule to accommodate an increase in content along with needed resources is acknowledged. A common curriculum approach is suggested for more purposeful art education for all students not just those focused on studio practice.

McMurrin, L.R. (1992). Principal's Role in Implementing Discipline-Based Art Education. *NAASP Bulletin,* 73, (517), 31-34.

Written by a superintendent of schools, the question is asked whether we are providing an art activity or an art education? Promotes the role of the principal as the educational leader responsible for initiating support in the development of programs. A list of activities is suggested to achieve successful implementation, gain support from parents and community

as the curriculum moves to a DBAE approach.

Risatti, H. (1987) Art Criticism in Discipline-based Art Education. *Journal of Aesthetic Education.* 21, (2), 217-225.

The study of art criticism is promoted as one of the disciplines of DBAE. The importance of criticism is seen as contributing to critical and analytic thinking skills that extend beyond contact with art history, production and aesthetics fostering higher level thinking in other areas.

Rubin, B.M. (1989) Using The Naturalistic Evaluation Process To Asses The Impact of DBAE. *NAASP Bulletin,* 73, (517), 36-41.

Rubin describes an approach for evaluating the success of programs dedicated to DBAE participation resulting from a summer institute experience. The natural method develops guidelines for observation and interviews through initial conversation and familiarization with considerable interaction between parties. Guidelines that focus observations and analysis are outlined, problems encountered are articulated along with findings. It is suggested that summer institutes have been highly successful in motivating teachers. Concerns arising out of the experience are listed along with findings . The naturalist approach gives a more realistic evaluation than surveys and checklists allowing for personal adjustments and reflection on the process of change.

Rush, J. C. (1987). Interlocking Images: The Conceptual Core of a Discipline-Based Art Lesson. *Studies in Art Education,* 28, (4), 206-220.

This article offers a unit of study presenting the idea that students will parallel the process of adult artists as a concept expressing activity. A consistent approach is provided that links all four DBAE components into structured lessons, sequenced in a carefully articulated model. Illustrations provide visual evidence of the sequences.

Spratt, F. (1987) Arts Production in Discipline-based Art Education. *Journal of Aesthetic Education,* 21, (2), 197-204.

The importance of making art through the mastering skills , developing observation, refining perception, and producing personal images is emphasized as critical to understanding the artistic process. The writer provides a rationale for the inclusion of studio experiences in making art objects as one part of a balanced program of art teaching.

Silverman, R.H. (1988). The Egalitarianism of Discipline-Based Art Education. *Art Education*, 41, (2), 13 - 18.

In defense of criticism that DBAE has too narrow a focus with an emphasis on a limited body of work, the author reviews positions of the approach emphasizing the importance of written curriculum for clarity and the inclusion of all students rather that just the talented few. Art is viewed not as elitist but democratic in its ideals as well as teaching practice. It has long been the position of DBAE that art is for everyone and that it can be taught by the generalist as well as the specialist.

Silverman, R.H. (1989) A Rationale for Discipline-Based Art Education. *NAASP Bulletin*, 73, (517), 17-22.

A brief review of background information on DBAE and efforts to move the teaching of art to a more inclusive general program of study. This author suggests that a more inclusive approach would better serve the needs of a broader range of students whose interests in art might lie outside of the traditional studio approach.

Sylva, R. (1993). Creation and Re-Creation in Art Education. *Art Education*, 46, (1), 7-11.

As a supporter of DBAE, the author suggests that we carefully examine the mode of delivery. Genuine engagement in the creative act at its most fundamental base is promoted as being more than projects and the consumption of art materials. Creating art as process related to forms and symbols of culture utilizing a range of experiences with media is discussed reflecting on that process with engagement and reflective distance.

Writers whose works appear in this second segment on DBAE are critical of the approach. Some take issue with specific aspects of the program design while others focus on the basic philosophical premise on which the program is based. Commentary is also included by those critics that while accepting the programs principles in part, seek to move in new directions suggesting greater inclusion and more flexibility.

Arnstine, D. (1990). Art, Aesthetics, and the Pitfalls of Discipline-Based Art Education. *Educational Theory*, 40, (4), 415-422.

Arnstine agues with intensity against DBAE in that it may impose cultures that are beyond the concerns of students and determined through models that do not speak directly to

student needs. Rationales stated as the perceived needs for DBAE, include academic rigor, college admissions, and SAT scores. Arnstine suggests that it is political pressure that drives the selection of this program. Arnstine argues that popular arts will be diminished over concerns for "fine arts" assuming this means masterpieces. Arnstine encourages the use of popular art with social significance and value along with an approach that maintains the integrity of the art experience for teachers and students. Collaborative planning is suggested between teacher and student.

Burton, J. M., & Lederman, A., & London, P., (Eds.) (1988). Beyond DBAE: The Case for Multiple Visions of Art. University Council on Art Education.

A collection of essays by twelve writers each having a particular view of DBAE and The Getty Center for Education in the Arts. All articles are included individually in this annotated bibliography. Most offer alternative avenues for art education while pointing to specific features that in their view create flaws or gaps in the current DBAE approach.

Burton, J.M. Aesthetics in Art Education: Meaning and Value in Practice. In Burton, J. M., & Lederman, A., & London, P., (Eds.) (1988). Beyond DBAE: The Case for Multiple Visions of Art. University Council on Art Education.

This writer supports art education as a domain of experience rather than the acquisition of knowledge per se. The aesthetic experience is considered as unitary and cognitive which would support integrated learning through art. The meaning of art comes from the students' direct encounter with materials and ideas rather than imposed from the outside through a formal system that would ways of knowing art into separate domains.

Burton, J. M. (1994). The Arts in School Reform: Other Conversations. *Teachers College Record*, 95, (4), 478-493.

Although this article is not directed to a specific criticism of DBAE, Burton argues for a more balanced approach , a child centered curriculum based on art experiences that involve students directly in the making of art. Art is itself the center of the experience while criticism, history and aesthetics are not at the core of art making but rather exist because of it and therefore remain tangential. It is proposed that studio experiences remain central to the direct needs of students in developmental, expressive and imaginative learning with genuine inquiry into other areas that directly inform that practice. Burton discusses the pros and cons of integrative curriculums, with a critical eye to national standards in

assessment that would in her view bring on a narrow view of measuring learning by over formulizing what should be a meaningful and rich experience.

Chalmers, F.G. (1987). Beyond Current Conceptions of Discipline-Based Art Education, *Art Education*. 40, (5), 58-61.

Criticism is directed to the narrowness of approach taken through the limits of the four areas identified as art disciplines. It is felt that scholarship from sociology, anthropology, and a host of other disciplines should be drawn into the mix. Interest in the study of art from varying perspectives is pointed out as missing in DBAE also resulting in a narrow frame within each of the selected special art disciplines.

DeChiara, E. (1988). DBAE: Does it Meet the Needs of Students with Handicapping Conditions? In Burton, J. M., & Lederman, A., & London, P., (Eds.) (1988). Beyond DBAE: The Case for Multiple Visions of Art. University Council on Art Education.

The central focus of DBAE on the four disciplines diminishes concern with students as central to learning. Students with disabilities might not fare well in a program that is high on structural framework and formalism while differences in learning needs are paid scant attention.

Ewens, T. (1988). Flawed Understandings: On Getty, Eisner and DBAE. In Burton, J. M., & Lederman, A., & London, P., (Eds.) (1988). Beyond DBAE: The Case for Multiple Visions of Art. University Council on Art Education.

An early critic of the DBAE approach, Ewens faults the DBAE premise that views arts education as limited in potential and having low status. He is critical of the early stand of Eisner in pointing out those perceived limitations and reviews these ideas negatively. Ewens finds nothing new in the basis on which DBAE is founded. It is proposed that the separation of art into distinct areas is counter productive and that there is no distinct separation in art although a distinction is made between knowing art and knowing about it.

Gilmour, J.C. (1994). Educating Imaginative Thinkers. *Teachers College Record*, 95, (4), 508-519.

Questions are raised in reference to the use of the imaginative, socially oriented and integrative approach of an artist such as Anselm Kiefer. Education needs to address the

development of skills in self expression, imagination, and search for personal meaning in cultural symbols. Particularly difficult for this author is the idea that disciplines can be defined and that they contain accepted methods and structures as suggested by proponents of DBAE. It is the education of the imagination that opens areas for challenging the mind rather than creating boundaries contained in structured disciplines.

Hausman, J.J. (1987). Another View of Discipline Based Art Education. *Art Education*, 40, (1), 56-60.

Hausman argues for a more open ended dynamic approach that seeks to embrace the struggle in encountering and experiencing art both as process and product. He is quick to point out that this does not imply an absence of discipline but rather a more individual approach unfettered by the need for uniformity in curriculum structure. The efforts of the Getty are applauded in bringing attention to the field but seen as just off the track.

Hausman, J. J. (1988) Unity and Diversity in Art Education. In Burton, J. M., & Lederman, A., & London, P., (Eds.) (1988). Beyond DBAE: The Case for Multiple Visions of Art. University Council on Art Education.

A call for unity in efforts to improve the teaching of art. Rather than polarize the debate, ways to support the teaching of art and art teachers need to be implemented. The author fears a top down political solution and would rather look to art teachers to strengthen the discipline from within.

Hamblen, K.A. (1987). An Examination of Discipline-Based Art Education Issues. *Studies in Art Education*, 28, (2), 68-78.

An examination of DBAE in the developmental stages looking at origins, meanings, and implications. It is suggested that choice is not an operating factor in this approach with choices being made by those designing the program rather than those carrying it out. Individual differences are diminished in the call for standardization of content resulting in lower rather than higher cognitive levels of achievement. DBAE might be considered as one of many options but should not be the only choice.

Huber, B.W. (1987). What does Feminism Have to Offer DBAE? Or So What If Little Red Riding Hood Puts Aside Her Crayons to Deliver Groceries For Her Mother? *Art Education*, 40, (3), 37-41.

In that DBAE is based heavily in the disciplines provided by a Western tradition that promotes the status quo, art educators must recognize the inequalities, dichotomies and misogynist stand of that tradition. By moving out and away from a studio-based center, male dominated theory and practice will diminish the worth of individual creation where women are more likely to develop their own aesthetic.

Lanier, V. (1987). A*R*T*, A Friendly Alternative to DBAE, *Art Education* , 40, (5), 46-52.

DBAE is described as having a philosophical base in Aristotelian realism thus providing the view that art that is structured, unchanging, formalist and unaltered by context. Lanier proposes a basis for art education in pragmatism which takes in social purposes embedded in contextual situations that bear impact on works of art. His aesthetic response theory would encompas an art teaching strategies to include the broadest possible range of experiences.

Lederman, A. (1998). Art for the Real World. In Burton, J. M., & Lederman, A., & London, P., (Eds.) (1988). Beyond DBAE: The Case for Multiple Visions of Art. University Council on Art Education.

Lederman argues for broad inclusion and feels that DBAE focuses on too narrow a cultural band. She passionately argues for a range of options that encompass the widest possible differences in cultural attitudes and ideas. Validating ethnic backgrounds along with the consideration of variety in art style, both high and low, should be part of the curriculum with choice in the hands of teachers.

Lidstone, J. (1988). Conversations with Myself. In Burton, J. M., & Lederman, A., & London, P., (Eds.) (1988). Beyond DBAE: The Case for Multiple Visions of Art. University Council on Art Education.

Lidstone refers to the opponents of DBAE as "developmentalists" and argues passionately for the freedom of art to allow choices. Faith in children as artists is maintained with inventiveness seen as an empowering force. We are warned not to be seduced by the power of funding.

London, P. (1988) To Gaze Again at the Stars. In Burton, J. M., & Lederman, A., & London, P., (Eds.) (1988). Beyond DBAE: The Case for Multiple Visions of Art. University Council on Art Education.

DBAE is faulted for a narrow view of art that reduces art education to the making of novel objects from a rational problem solving approach. London denies the existence of a close relationship between practitioners of the four discipline domains. It is suggested that disciplines such as criticism require a critical mass of information prior to an authentic educational experience. DBAE is seen as a reinforcement of the isolated stand of school curriculums on contemporary culture and society at odds with how the world works. London proposes his own vision as an education of the senses, our own time and the imagination , full of the expression of passion, fantasy, courage, etc. empowering students to wonder.

Manley-Delacruz, E. (1990). Revisiting Curriculum Conceptions: A Thematic Perspective. *Visual Arts Research*, 16, (2), 10-25.

Debate and conflicting viewpoints are seen as positive reflection in decision making. A review of curriculum orientations by earlier writers Eisner, and Vallence in 1974 and Geroux, Penna, and Pinar in 1981 establish a framework for discussion on DBAE. A model of two distinct orientations in curriculum, social and personal clarifies the positions of these writers. Early influences on DBAE are attributed to the work of Barkan, Bruner and Broudy in considering a structural and knowledge base for art education. The work of Greer, the influence of the Rand study, and an overview of the position and basic tenets of the DBAE position are discussed. Issues include moving from a child oriented curriculum to a content based curriculum with recommendations for informed curricular decisions based on a synthesis of competing positions.

Qualley, C.A. (1989). Discipline-Based Art Education: Seeking Its Origins and Considering the Alternatives. *NAASP Bulletin*, 73, (517),1-6.

Describes the DBAE approach as continuing to make an impression on visual arts education. The program was developed not by an outside group but with the advice and counsel of those closely associated with art teaching. Acceptance of current theory and scholarship however was not found in schools surveyed, creating a gap between theorists and practitioners. .

Stinespring, J.A. (1992). DBAE and Criticism. *Arts Education Policy Review*. 94, (2), 20-25.

This article focuses on the discipline of criticism with the notion that the field itself is fraught with difficulty and varying perspectives. Given the variety of approaches to art by critics, he doubts that a clear and cogent methodology could be established by teachers with little background in criticism. The difficulty of language is cited along with obscure references unknown to the general public as not within the realm of what is needed in the school setting. He argues with the DBAE approach that uses critics as models and does not find this a practical model for designing a curriculum. This author would substitute analysis for criticism and base curriculum models on the work of Feldman and Mittler. That approach uses description, analysis, interpretation, and judgment.

Wieder, C.E. (1990) Essentialist Tools of the DBAE Approach to Curriculum: A Critique, *Visual Arts Research*, 16, (2), 26-30.

Describes the "essentialist" position of Eisner and what is meant by the term "discipline". Wieder suggests that DBAE downplays the ideas of Broudy who uses the term discipline as the trait of a self-disciplined mind. Reviews key features of DBAE writers Day and Greer.

Zessoules, R. & Wolf, D. P. & Gardner, H. . Better Balance: ARTS PROPEL as an Alternative to Discipline Based Art Education. In Burton, J. M., & Lederman, A., & London, P., (Eds.) (1988). Beyond DBAE: The Case for Multiple Visions of Art. University Council on Art Education.

The efforts of Getty are applauded in moving art to the center of debate and in obtaining a place for the arts at the national level. ARTS PROPEL is viewed as an alternative to DBAE in that it places the student and the production of art at the center. ARTS PROPEL is briefly described.

ADVANCED PLACEMENT AND INTERNATIONAL BACCALAUREATE

The following list includes the literature for both IB and AP programs, separated into two distinct lists. Those publications mentioning both programs are listed twice with appropriate comments for each. Included in this section are additional publications from The College Board that although may not speak directly to the portfolio process, serve as additional information on assessment and learning in the arts. Also listed are articles with information on the entire IB program but not dedicated to art.

INTERNATIONAL BACCALAUREATE

Anderson, T. (1994). The International Baccalaureate Model of Content-based Art Education. *Art Education*, 47, (2), 19-24.

An enthusiastic review of the program with illustrations from student research notebooks. The IB approach is applauded as an excellent example of a student centered program with a strong focus on content, high expectations, and flexibility. Criteria for evaluation are explained.

Blaikie, F. (1994). Values Inherent in Qualitative Assessment of Secondary Studio Art in North America: Advanced Placement, Arts PROPEL, and International Baccalaureate. *Studies in Art Education*, 35, (4), 237-248.

Blaikie offers a comparative view of common practice and themes in assessment within these three programs. Major differences are seen in the focus of IB and Arts PROPEL in assessing process while AP places a greater stress on form.

Chalmers, F.G. (1989) The International Baccalaureate (I.B.) Art/Design Program. *School Arts*, 88, 9, 35-36.

A short overview of program aims and what examiners look for in research workbooks and evidence of studio performance. Illustrations of student work are included.

Clark, G. A. & E. Zimmerman. (1994) Programming Opportunities for Students Gifted and Talented in the Visual Arts, National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented, Storrs, CT.

The IB program is mentioned briefly in this publication as one of many options available for students considered gifted.

Fox, E. (1985). International Schools and the International Baccalaureate. *Harvard Educational Review*, 55, (1), 53-68.

Although this article does not apply directly to the art and design elective, it is an excellent document on the development and history of the program and includes statistical information on assessment.

International Baccalaureate Program Materials, (1995), New York: International Baccalaureate North America

This publication includes directories, outline of program, college information and acceptance of credits, forms for ordering additional information on subject areas including a slide packet of student samples for art and design.

Peterson, A.D.C. (1983) Learning From Experience in the International Baccalaureate Program. *The Journal of General Education*, 35, (1), 15-25.

A general overview of program requirements pointing out differences found between IB and the standard American high school course of study.

Tyson, D.C. (1984). A Test of Character: The International Baccalaureate in America. *Independent School.*, 44, (1), 55-56.

The author encourages participation on the part of schools recommending the program as academically rigorous and as a valid approach to evaluation with positive implications for college admission.

ADVANCED PLACEMENT / THE COLLEGE BOARD

Advanced Placement Course Description, Art. (1996/97). New York: The College Board.

The course description includes a detailed description of both studio portfolios and the examination in AP History of Art. Frequent updates apprise teachers of any change in requirements. Bibliographies and suggestions for resources are included for all portfolios.

Advanced Placement Course Materials, (1996) New York: The College Board.

General information on college acceptance of credit, ordering forms for additional information for specific subject areas, including copies of past examinations and slide samples.

Blaikie, F. (1994). Values Inherent in Qualitative Assessment of Secondary Studio Art in North America: Advanced Placement, Arts PROPEL, and International Baccalaureate. *Studies in Art Education*. 35, (4), 237-248.

Offers a comparative view of common practice and themes in assessment within these three programs. Major differences are seen in the focus of IB and Arts PROPEL in assessing process while AP places a greater stress on form.

Carnes, V. (1992) Teacher's Guide to Advanced Placement Courses in Studio Art. New York: The College Board.

Syllabi from eight programs are outlined to provide a range of models with differing perspectives and approaches in structuring AP studio courses. Topics covered include evaluation, selection of students, taking slides and resources. This publication is currently being revised.

Clark, G. A. & E. Zimmerman. (1994) Programming Opportunities for Students Gifted and Talented in the Visual Arts, National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented, Storrs, CT.

AP is mentioned briefly as one of many possible programs for students designated as gifted and talented in the visual arts. An AP program in Winnetka, It is one of many other programs in a series of case studies.

Hoffa, H. (1987) Preparing High School Students for Admission to College Art Departments. *Art Education*, 40, (1), 16-22.

The author presents a general approach to the preparation of portfolios for college admission. AP is mentioned as one approach for achieving positive results.

Mitchell, R. & A. Stempell. (1991) The Advanced Placement Studio Art Portfolio Evaluation: A Case Study of National Portfolio Assessment. (Six Case-Studies of Performance Assessment Prepared For the Office of Technology Assessment, Council For Basic Education.

A six case study investigation of performance assessment one of which is is the Advanced Placement studio art portfolio evaluation. The researchers conducted on site observations of the adjudication process as well as visits to schools participating in the program. Personnel from ETS, teachers and faculty consultants were interviewed.

Myford, C.M. & R.J. Mislevy. (1995) Monitoring and Improving a Portfolio Assessment System. (Center For Performance Assessment, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, NJ)

Report of a study carried out during the 1992 AP Studio Art portfolio grading sessions. The study collected information on scoring that showed diversity, and interviewed faculty consultants in an effort to determine how the current system functions. A statistical framework was constructed to be used along with interviews for additional feedback. The aim of the study was to provide information on which to base consultant training, refine rubrics, and test the process in place.

Wolf, D.P & T. Wolf (1985) Academic Preparation in the Arts: Teaching for Transition From High School To College. New York: The College Board.

Known as "the red book", this text follows a previous publication of 1983 from the same source that included the arts among the disciplines important as preparation for college. Here, a more specific outline is provided specific to the arts. The arts are enthusiastically supported as essential in preparing students for college work not only in arts areas but as part of an overall educational background. Offered are general strategies for teaching, support for programs and assessment.

ARTS PROPEL

Articles noted in this section are primarily commentaries on ARTS PROPEL. A large body of critical literature has not developed solely dedicated to ARTS PROPEL, therefore material mentioning Arts PROPEL as part of other material is also included.

Blaikie, F. (1994). Values Inherent in Qualitative Assessment of Secondary Studio Art in North America: Advanced Placement, Arts PROPEL, and International Baccalaureate. *Studies in Art Education*. 35, (4), 237-248.

Blalikie offers a comparative view of common practice and themes in assessment within these three programs. Major differences are seen in the focus of IB and Arts PROPEL in assessing process while AP places a greater stress on form.

Brandt, R. (1988). On Assessment in the Arts: A Conversation with Howard Gardner, *Educational Leadership*, 45, (4), 30-34.

The interview touches on the ARTS PROPEL project and what it seeks to accomplish in assessing student work. Related information on the theory of multiple intelligences brings additional information to the understanding of this portfolio method.

Gardner, H. (1983). Artistic Intelligences, *Art Education.* 36, (2), 47-49.

Gardner discusses cognition and artistic intelligences as literacy in the arts is gained through the development of symbols. He places artistic intelligence as one of many without hierarchical order , urging education to look again at learning from a variety of perspectives. Involvement with art helps children experience learning in the fullest sense.

Gardner, H. (1989). Project Zero: an Introduction to Arts Propel. *Journal of Art & Design Education, 8, (2),* 167-182.

Gardner describes the beginnings of ARTS PROPEL and the philosophical underpinnings that prompted the establishment of Project Zero. Early findings are reported in developmental learning along with a brief view of the uses and ideas of multiple intelligences. The Project Zero approach to artistic learning is described with emphasis on process and reflection. This assessment process seeks to establish a psychometric measure of the portfolio process.

Gitomer, D. & S. Grosh, K. Price. (1992). Portfolio Culture in Arts Education. *Art Education,* 45, (1), 7-15.

The author describes assessment as embedded in a working process. ARTS PROPEL assessment establishes a culture where building a portfolio of experiences rather than a judgment of the end product is viewed as learning. Assessment is seen as process though dialogue, personal reflection and critique.

Winner, E. & S. Simmons (Eds.). (1993) Arts Propel: A Handbook For Visual Arts. Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J. Policy Information Center.

Illustrates the development of student work through a process evaluation format with comments from students and teachers.

Wolf, D.P. & N. Pistone (1995) Taking Full Measure: Rethinking Assessment Through the Arts. New York: The College Board.

Portfolio review is described through working with students based on the process -folio ideas proposed by Arts PROPEL which are outlined.

Zessoules, R. & Wolf, D. P. & Gardner, H. . Better Balance: ARTS PROPEL as an Alternative to Discipline Based Art Education. In Burton, J. M., & Lederman, A., & London, P., (Eds.) (1988). Beyond DBAE: The Case for Multiple Visions of Art. University Council on Art Education.

Also included in the section on DBAE, this article gives a quick overview of ARTS PROPEL citing differences between the two approaches. ARTS PROPEL focuses on the integration of multiple ways of knowing while DBAE separates the four components. ARTS PROPEL is viewed as an alternative to DBAE in that it places the student and the production of art at the center.

NATIONAL STANDARDS IN THE VISUAL ARTS

The following writers are advocates of national standards either as enthusiasts or as supporters with minor cautions and reservations. Also listed are the publications on standards and other printed materials that are part of that documentation.

Dilger, S. (1995). Policy and Administrative Issues Related to the Implementation of the National Standards for Arts Education, *Translations: From Theory to Practice*, 5, (2), NAEA.

This article raises issues of commitment to and promotion of standards at the state and local level. Shared vision, effective assessment practice, and professional development are seen as essential.

Down, A.G. (1993). The Tempest of the Arts and National Standards. *The School Administrator*, 50, (5). 48.

As the chair of the national committed for the National Arts Standards Project, the enthusiasm of Downs statement is understandable. He believes the arts to be a primary link for interdisciplinary study, as well as a moving force in new assessment models.

Hausman, J. J. (1994) Standards and Assessment - New Initiatives and Continuing Dilemmas. *Art Education*, 47, (2), 9 - 13.

A commentary on the development of standards and the need to invest in agreed upon understandings of what can and should be accomplished through standards. Caution is noted in the uses of standards, in setting unrealistic expectation and maintaining balance.

Hausman, J.J. (1994) National Standards for Visual Arts Education. *NAEA Advisory Series*, (Ed. A.N. Johnson).Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.

A brief, two page summary outlining basic content guidelines of standards in the visual arts with a statement of support.

Hoffa, Harlan. (1994). National Standards: The Whys and What Fors. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 96, (2), 16-25.

Hoffa begins by tracing the development of early ideas seminal to shared interests and standards in the arts, placing the current publication of the National Standards for Arts Education in historical perspective. The political necessity of drawing support

and majority participation from beyond the teaching profession is presented with some regret. Problems related to the independence of arts teaching in forging individual programs are articulated along with the lack of cohesion and collaboration across arts disciplines. Key to advocacy and implementation will be organizational strength and staff development at all levels.

Hope, S. (1993). An Open Letter on Standards. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 95, (1), 36-39.

A brief history of the development of standards in the arts establishes a rational base in presenting an optimistic view of the process and outcomes of the collective wisdom of those involved in standard writing. Caution in the use and misuse of the standards is articulated along with issues of integration of the arts , connections to other disciplines and resources. The importance of integrity through thoughtful planning mindful substance in the implementation and use of standards is stressed.

MENC, (1994) The Vision for Arts Education in the 21st Century. Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.

There is a good deal of rhetoric here on the development of standards as a variety of participants speak to specific issues discussed during the process of establishing consensus, goals, theory, practice, and clarity. Much of what is stated is promotion, encouraging the use of standards with rationales based on the value of arts education for business, politics, and societal well being.

MENC, (1994) Summary Statement: Education Reform, Standards, and the Arts, Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.

An eight page brochure highlighting the importance and benefits of standards and implementation.

MENC, (1994) National Standards for Arts Education:Dance, Music, Theater, Visual Arts: What Every Young American Should Know and Be Able to Do in the Arts. Reston, VA, Music Educators National Conference.

The complete statement of standards for all arts disciplines. Introductions are provided on the importance and benefits to be derived from adoption. Essential issues addressed include diversity, technology, integration, and correlation. Specific standards and expectations are divided into grade level groups that list content standards followed by two

levels of achievement, proficient and advanced. Glossaries are provided for each discipline along with an outline of sequential learning.

NAEA, (1994) The National Visual Arts Standards. Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.

This document contains only those standards that apply to the visual arts. All introductory information of a general nature on benefits, integration, correlation, assessment, etc. are included taking the same form as in the larger editions dedicated to all arts.

Writers following, raise a number of questions on the wisdom of national standards. In some instances, articles are repeated from other sections as the authors touch on more than one area.

Colwell, R. (1995). Will Voluntary National Standards Fix the Potholes of Arts Education? *Arts Education Policy Review*, 96, (5), 2-11.

The lack of empirical research, analysis of program initiatives and assessment strategies leaves the current call for standards on shaky ground. The political imperatives, power and public relation support of government agencies and well funded centers may result in empty rhetoric with little to show in the end as improvement in arts education. The author suggests that attention to good programs in added resources, time and support of inspired teaching is at the heart of the matter. Major changes in teaching and learning need the support of empirical research and an informed public for stability and continuance.

Burton, J. M. (1994). The Arts in School Reform: Other Conversations. *Teachers College Record*, 95, (4), 478-493.

Burton discusses the pros and cons of integrative curriculums, with a critical eye to national standards in assessment that would in her view bring on a narrow view of measuring learning by over formulizing what should be a meaningful and rich experience.

Greene, M. (1994). The Arts and National Standards. *The Educational Forum*, 58, 391-400.

Maxine Greene is skeptical of standards that are imposed from without or characterized as nationally uniform and thus quantifiable. Her plea is for an education in the arts that is celebratory of the individual quest for identity and knowledge. The dialogue must remain open, free and unfettered by standards that speak only to those avenues of learning that

define goals in narrow terms. The current set of national standards in the arts is described as ambiguous while differences in the arts are neglected.

Ross, J. (1994). National Standards for Arts Education: The Emperor's New Clothes. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 96, (2), 26-30.

The establishment of a voluntary set of standards is supported but seen as unattainable given the current state of support and climate that exists in the majority of schools. The views of the standards are seen as simplistic, ignoring the unique contexts of individual schools. A concern for who does the teaching, how it is taught, and evaluation procedures is also voiced. The author proposes an approach based more closely on the developmental ideas of Lowenfeld, the philosophy of Dewey, and others. In addition, there is the fear that unless usable curricula are implemented, standards will remain on the shelf.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

55 Schools listed returned address forms along with the survey. Three additional schools returned the survey but did not return address forms and are not listed.

Schools are listed by geographic regions according to the sequence of schools in the Porter Sargent Handbook Series, 1985. (see map, page 69) Information on enrollment and school types is also taken from Porter Sargent.

Geographic Region 1			
Avon Old Farm School	bdg & day	14 - 19 boys	enrl - 370
Brooks School	bdg & day	13 - 19 coed	enrl - 334
Browning School	day	5 - 18 boys	enrl - 300
Hamden Hall Country Day School	day	4 - 18 coed	enrl - 550
Kingswood-Oxford School	day	11- 18 coed	enrl - 490
King & Low-Heywood Thomas School	day	3 - 18 coed	enrl - 448
The Master's School	day	3 - 17 coed	enrl - 402
Milton Academy	bdg. & day	5 - 18 coed	enrl - 966
Notre Dame Academy	day	13 - 18 girls	enrl - 308
Phillips Exeter Academy	bdg & day	14 - 18 coed	enrl - 992
Portledge School	day	3 - 18 coed	enrl - 305
Saint Margaret's-McTernan School	day	5 - 18 coed	enrl - 366
Winsor School	day	10 - 18 girls	enrl - 403
Geographic Region 2			
Allendale Columbia School	day	3 -18 coed	enrl - 443
Blair Academy	bdg & day	13 - 19 coed	enrl - 390
Bryn Mawr School	day	2 - 18 girls	enrl - 865
The Chapin School	day	5 - 18 girls	enrl - 593
Dwight School	day	5 - 18 coed	enrl - 377
Elmwood Franklin School	day	4 - 14 coed	enrl - 330
Georgetown Preparatory School	bdg & day	14 - 18 boys	enrl - 397
Gilman School	day	5 - 18 boys	enrl - 952
Haverford School	day	4 - 19 boys	enrl - 750
Maret School	day	5 - 17 coed	enrl - 524
Mercersburg Academy	bdg & day	14 - 18 coed	enrl - 380
Packer Collegiate Institute	day	13 - 18 coed	enrl - 821
Sandy Spring Friends School	bdg & day	3 - 18 coed	enrl - 399
St. Joseph's Collegiate Institute	day	13 - 18 boys	enrl - 800
William Penn Charter School	day	5 - 18 coed	enrl - 833
Geographic Region 3			
Canterbury School	day	5 - 18 coed	enrl - 402
Cape Henry Collegiate School	day	3 - 18 coed	enrl - 687
Forsyth Country Day School	day	4 - 18 coed	enrl - 726
Madeira School	bdg & day	13 - 18 girls	enrl - 298
Potomac School	day	4 - 18 coed	enrl - 876
Saint. Catherine's School	bdg & day	4 - 18 girls	enrl - 718
Saint Stephen's Episcopal School	day	4 - 18 coed	enrl - 440

Geographic Region 4			
Altamont School	day	10 - 18 coed	enrl - 307
Baylor School	bdg & day	14 - 18 coed	enrl - 800
Fort Worth Country Day School	day	5 - 18 coed	enrl - 972
Montgomery Academy	day	5 - 18 coed	enrl - 844
Montgomery Bell Academy	day	12 -18 boys	enrl - 514
Saint John's School	day	5 - 18 coed	enrl - 1196
Sayre School	day	3 - 18 coed	enrl - 510
Geographic Region 5			
The Prairie School	day	3 - 18 coed	enrl - 518
Western Reserve Academy	bdg & day	13 - 18 coed	enrl - 375
University Liggett School	day	3 - 18 coed	enrl - 765
Francis W. Parker School	day	4 - 17 coed	enrl - 795
Geographic Region 6			
John Burroughs School	day	12 -18 coed	enrl - 579
Whitfield School	day	12 -18 coed	enrl - 344
Geographic Region 7			
Kent Denver School	day	12 -18 coed	enrl - 582
Geographic Region 8			
Buckley School	day	3 - 18 coed	enrl - 750
Catlin Gabel School	day	3 - 18 coed	enrl - 670.
Crystal Springs Uplands School	day	12 - 18 coed	enrl - 353
Head-Royce School	day	5 - 18 coed	enrl - 685
Oakwood School	day	5 - 18 coed	enrl - 634
Saint George's School	day	5 - 18 coed	enrl - 280

School Types		
Boarding and Day		12
Day		42
Girls		6
Boys		7
Coed		41
Average Enrollment		576
Geographic		
Northeast	Areas 1 and 2	28
Southeast	Areas 3 and 4	14
Midwest	Areas 5 and 6	6
West	Areas 7 and 8	7

APPENDIX B - SCHOOLS INTERVIEWED BY PHONE

From the list of 55 (Appendix - A) schools returning surveys, twenty one were selected at random for an interview by phone. Schools were selected by geographic regions in order to maintain a random average view. Interviews were conducted from April 18 - April 30, 1996.

Geographic Region 1			
Avon Old Farm School	bdg & day	14 - 19 boys	enrl - 370
King & Low-Heywood Thomas School	day	3 - 18 coed	enrl - 448
Geographic Region 2			
Dwight School	day	5 - 18 coed	enrl - 377
Gilman School	day	5 - 18 boys	enrl - 952
Haverford School	day	4 - 19 boys	enrl - 750
Packer Collegiate Institute	day	13 - 18 coed	enrl - 821
St. Joseph's Collegiate Institute	day	13 - 18 boys	enrl - 800
William Penn Charter School	day	5 - 18 coed	enrl - 833
Geographic Section 3			
Madeira School	bdg & day	13 - 18 girls	enrl - 298
Cape Henry Collegiate School	day	3 - 18 coed	enrl - 687
Saint Stephen's Episcopal School	day	4 - 18 coed	enrl - 440
Forsyth Country Day School	day	4 - 18 coed	enrl - 726
Geographic Region 4			
Fort Worth Country Day School	day	5 - 18 coed	enrl - 972
Saint John's School	day	5 - 18 coed	enrl - 1196
Montgomery Academy	day	5 - 18 coed	enrl - 844
Geographic Region 5			
The Prairie School	day	3 - 18 coed	enrl - 518
Western Reserve Academy	bdg & day	13 - 18 coed	enrl - 375
Geographic Area 8			
Head-Royce School	day	5 - 18 coed	enrl - 685
Saint George's School	day	5 - 18 coed	enrl - 280
Crystal Springs Uplands School	day	12 - 18 coed	enrl - 353
Catlin Gabel School	day	3 - 18 coed	enrl - 670

School Types	
Boarding and Day	3
Day	18
Girls	1
Boys	4
Coed	16
Average Enrollment	633
Geographic	
Northeast Areas 1 and 2	8
Southeast Areas 3 and 4	7
Midwest and West Areas 5, 6, 7 and 8	6

Source: The Handbook of Private Schools, 1985, Porter Sargent.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX C - ORIGINAL SURVEY FORM

Dear Colleagues in Visual Arts,

I am a teacher of visual arts at The Westminster Schools, Atlanta, GA. This year, as a Klingenstein Fellow at Teachers College, Columbia University, I am working on a study of factors that influence curriculum planning in visual arts education. I would greatly appreciate and value 10 minutes of your time to complete this survey and mail it back to me by March 18 in the enclosed stamped envelope. All respondents will receive a summary of findings. No individual comments from the survey will be used and only group data will be shared.

For each statement or question, please circle the statement(s) that apply in your situation. Use the space under the question to share your candid thoughts or comments. Many Thanks, Virginia Carnes

1. Who decides what should be taught in visual arts courses?
   - A. I make all decisions for my own courses.
   - B. Decisions are made by department consensus.
   - C. Decisions are made by the department chair
   - D. All course decisions are made by other administrators.
   - E. Decisions are arrived at collaboratively with visual arts faculty, the department chair, or other administrators.

Comments:

2. How is credit awarded for visual arts courses?
   - A. Elective only , no credit assigned.
   - B. Elective with limited credit.
   - C. Full credit as an academic discipline.
   - D. Limited academic credit.
   - E. AP art courses are given academic credit.

Comments:

3. How do visual arts courses relate to other academic disciplines?
   - A. All courses, visual arts included, are separate and distinct.
   - B. We have a highly integrated inter-disciplinary program.
   - C. The visual arts are integrated in a limited way in other departments.
   - D. Visual arts faculty initiate curriculum integration.

Comments:

4. The following programs have influenced curriculum planning in visual arts.
   - A. Advanced Placement Program of The College Board.
   - B. International Baccalaureate
   - C. National Standards in the Visual Arts
   - D. Arts Propel
   - E. The Getty Discipline Based Arts Education Program.
   - F. Portfolio Assessment Initiatives
   - G. National Art Education Association

Comments:

5. We participate in the following programs:
   A. Advanced Placement Portfolio Exams of The College Board.
   B. International Baccalaureate
   C. National Standards in the Visual Arts
   D. Arts Propel
   E. Getty Discipline Based Arts Education
   F. Portfolio Assessment

Comments:

6. Visual arts faculty have participated in programs / workshops that offer training in:
   A. Advanced Placement, The College Board.
   B. International Baccalaureate Program
   C. National Standards in the Visual Arts
   D. Arts Propel
   E. Getty Discipline Based Art Education.
   F. Portfolio Assessment.

Comments

7. How are students evaluated in visual arts courses?
   A. Each faculty member determines criteria for student evaluation.
   B. The department designs assessment criteria collaboratively .
   C. There is no formal grading or assessment of students in the visual arts.
   D. Portfolio review is part of our assessment.
   E. Portfolio review is the major method of assessing achievement.

Comments:

8. In selecting additional faculty, the art department prefers.
   A. Professionally trained artists in specific media.
   B. Teachers knowledgeable about national efforts in arts education.
   C. Teachers with both, a professional art background, and knowledge of national efforts in arts education.

Comments:

APPENDIX D - CONTACT RESOURCES

Listed in this section are contacts, addresses, phone and fax where available. Every effort has been made to provide up to date information.

Advanced Placement Program of The College Board

Regional Offices and Contacts

Middle States: Janet Heiler, Associate Director
Suite 410, 3440 Market Street Philadelphia, PA 19104-3338 (215) 387-7600

Midwest: Robert McDonough, Director
Suite 401, 1800 Sherman Avenue Evanston, IL 60201-3715 (708) 866-1700

New England: Fred Wetzel, Director
470 Totten Pond Road Waltham, MA 02154-1982 (617) 890-9150

South: Geoffrey Freer, Director
Suite 250, 2970 Clairmont Road Atlanta, GA 30329-1639 (404) 636-9465

Southwest: Paul Williamson, Director
Suite 1050, 98 San Jacinto Boulevard Austin, TX 78701-4039 (512) 472-0231

West: Lindy Daters: Director
Suite 480, 2099 Gateway Place San Jose, CA 95110-1017 (408) 452-1400

Denver Office: Mary Nickerson: Director
Suite 900, 4155 E. Jewell Avenue Denver, CO 80222-4510 (303) 759-1800

National Offices

New York: Wade Curry, AP Programs Director
45 Columbus Avenue, NY, NY, 10023-6992 (212) 713-8000

The National Center For Cross-Disciplinary Teaching and Learning

The College Board, Office of Academic Affairs
45 Columbus Avenue
New York, New York, 10023-6992 (212) 713-8000

The Role of the Arts in Unifying the High School Curriculum

Karen Wicks, Director for Curriculum and Instructional Development
The College Board
45 Columbus Avenue
New York, New York, 10023-6992 (212) 713-8215

International Baccalaureate

International Baccalaureate North America
200 Madison Avenue, Suite 2007 NY, NY 10016 (212) 696-4464
FAX (212) 889-9242

Arts PROPEL

Project Zero Development Group
Harvard Graduate School of Education
323 Longfellow Hall, Appian Way Cambridge, MA 02138 (617) 495-4342
FAX (617) 495-9709

Arts Propel
Arts Propel Handbooks
Office of School Services (MS 39-V)
Educational Testing Service Princeton, NJ 08541

PROPEL/Arts PROPEL
Pittsburgh Public Schools
341 South Bellefield Avenue Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Professional Organizations

National Art Education Association (703) 860-8000
1916 Association Drive
Reston, VA 22091-1690

National Association of Independent Schools
Stephen C. Clem, Vice President for Educational Leadership
1620 L Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20036-5605 (202) 973-9700
FAX (202) 973-9790

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Amdur, D. (1993). Arts and Cultural Context, A Curriculum Integrating Discipline-Based Art Education with Other Humanities Subjects at the Secondary Level. *Art Education*, 46, (3), 12-19.

Anderson, T. (1995). Rediscovering the Connection between the Arts: Introduction to the Symposium on Interdisciplinary Arts Education. *Arts Education Policy Review* , 96, (4), 10-12.

Anderson, T. (1994). The International Baccalaureate Model of Content-based Art Education. *Art Education*. 47, (2), 19-24.

Arnstine, D. (1990). Art, Aesthetics, and the Pitfalls of Discipline-Based Art Education. *Educational Theory*, 40, (4), 415-422.

Beattie, D.K. (1994) The Mini-Portfolio: Locus of A Successful Performance Examination. *Art Education*, 47, (2), 14-18.

Blaikie, F. (1994). Values Inherent in Qualitative Assessment of Secondary Studio Art in North America: Advanced Placement, Arts PROPEL, and International Baccalaureate. *Studies in Art Education*. 35, (4), 237-248.

Blodget, A.S. (1991). Rigor Mortis in the Arts. *Design For Arts in Education*, 93, (1), 41-44.

Brandt, R. (1988). On Assessment in the Arts: A Conversation with Howard Gardner, *Educational Leadership*, 45, (4), 30-34.

Brandt, R. (1992). On Performance Assessment: A Conversation with Grant Wiggins. *Educational Leadership*. 49, (8), 35-37.

Bresler, L. (1995). The Subservient, Co-Equal, Affective, and Social Integration Styles and Their Implications for the Arts. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 96, (5), 31-37.

Bresler, L. (1995). Introduction to the Symposium on the Integration of the Arts into the Curriculum: Part 1. The United States. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 96, (5), 12-13.

Brigham, D. Doing DBAE Differently to Achieve its Primary Goal. In Burton, J. M., & Lederman, A., & London, P., (Eds.) (1988). Beyond DBAE: The Case for Multiple Visions of Art. University Council on Art Education.

Broudy, H.S. (1990). DBAE: Complaints, Reminiscences, and Response. *Educational Theory*, 40, (4), 431-435.

Burton, J. M., & Lederman, A., & London, P., (Eds.) (1988). Beyond DBAE: The Case for Multiple Visions of Art. University Council on Art Education.

Burton, J.M. Aesthetics in Art Education: Meaning and Value in Practice. In Burton, J. M., & Lederman, A., & London, P., (Eds.) (1988). Beyond DBAE: The Case for Multiple Visions of Art. University Council on Art Education.

Burton, J. M. (1994). The Arts in School Reform: Other Conversations. *Teachers College Record.* 95, (4), 478-493.

Carnes, V. (1992) Teacher's Guide to Advanced Placement Courses in Studio Art. New York: The College Board.

Carr, J. (1991). Four Types of Art Teachers for Talented Art Students. *Roeper Review,* 13, (2), 71-73.

Chalmers, F.G. (1987). Beyond Current Conceptions of Discipline-Based Art Education. *Art Education.* 40, (5), 58-61.

Chalmers, F.G. (1989) The International Baccalaureate (I.B.) Art/Design Program. *School Arts.* 88, 9, 35-36.

Clark, G.A. & M. D. Day, & W.D. Greer (1987) Discipline-based Art Education: Becoming Students of Art. *Journal of Aesthetic Education.* 21, (2), 129-193.

Clark, G. A. & E. Zimmerman. (1994) Programming Opportunities for Students Gifted and Talented in the Visual Arts, National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented, Storrs, CT.

Colwell, R. (1995). Will Voluntary National Standards Fix the Potholes of Arts Education? *Arts Education Policy Review,* 96, (5), 2-11.

Crawford, D. (1987) Aesthetics in Discipline-based Art Education. *Journal of Aesthetic Education,* 21, (2), 227-239.

Davis, J.D. (1993). Art Education in the 1990's: Meeting the Challenges of Accountability. *Studies in Art Education.* 34, (2), 82- 90.

Day, M.D. (1985). Evaluating Student Achievement in Discipline-Based Art Programs. *Studies in Art Education.* 26, (4), 232-240.

Day, M.D. (1987). Discipline-Based Art Education in Secondary Classrooms. *Studies in Art Education.* 28, (4), 235-241.

Day, M.D. (1989). The Characteristics, Benefits, and Problems Associated With Implementing DBAE. *NAASP Bulletin,* 73, (517), 43-52.

Day, M.D. & Kay Alexander. (1991) Discipline Based Art Education: A Curriculum Sampler. Santa Monica, CA: The Getty Center for Education in the Arts.

DeChiara, E. (1988). DBAE: Does it Meet the Needs of Students with Handicapping Conditions? In Burton, J. M., & Lederman, A., & London, P., (Eds.) (1988). Beyond DBAE: The Case for Multiple Visions of Art. University Council on Art Education.

DiBlasio, M.K. (1985). Continuing the Tradition: Further Delineation of the DBAE Format.*Studies in Art Education* . 26, (4). 197-205.

DiBlasio, M.K. (1987). Reflections on the Theory of Discipline-Based Art Education. *Studies in Art Education*. 28, (4), 221-226.

Dilger, S. (1995). Policy and Administrative Issues Related to the Implementation of the National Standards for Arts Education, *Translations: From Theory to Practice*, 5, (2), NAEA.

Dobbs, S.M. (1989). Discipline-Based Art Education: Some Questions and Answers. *NAASP Bulletin*. 73, (517), 7-13.

Donmoyer, R. (1995). The Arts as Modes of Learning and Methods of Teaching: A (Borrowed and Adapted) Case for Integrating the Arts across the Curriculum. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 96, (5), 14-20.

Dorn, C.M. (1990). An Annotated Bibliography on Evaluation and Testing in Visual Arts Education. *Design for Arts in Education*. 91 (3) 34-41.

Down, A.G. (1993). The Tempest of the Arts and National Standards. *The School Administrator*. 50, (5). 48.

Duke, L.L. (1984). The Getty Center for Education in the Arts. *Phi Delta Kappan*. 65, (9), 612-614.

Duke, L.L. (1988). The Getty Center for Education in the Arts and Discipline-Based Art Education. *Art Education*. 41, (2) 7-12.

Dunn, P.C. (1995). Integrating the Arts: Renaissance and Reformation in Arts Education. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 96, (4), 32-37.

Efland, A. D. (1987) Curriculum Antecedents of Discipline-based Art Education. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*. 21, (2), 57-93.

Eisner, E.W. (1987). The Role of Discipline-Based Art Education in America's Schools. *Art Education*. 40, (5), 6-45.

Eisner, E. W. (1990). Discipline-Based Art Education: Conceptions and Misconceptions. *Educational Theory*, 40, (2), 423-430.

Eisner, E. (1994) Multiple Intelligences: The Theory in Practice by Howard Gardner. *Teachers College Record*, 95 (4), 555-560.

Ewens, T. (1988). Flawed Understandings: On Getty, Eisner and DBAE. In Burton, J. M., & Lederman, A., & London, P., (Eds.) (1988). Beyond DBAE: The Case for Multiple Visions of Art. University Council on Art Education.

Freeman, J. (1987). The International Baccalaureate. *The College Board Review*, (143), 4-6,40.

Fox, E. (1985) International Schools and the International Baccalaureate. *Harvard Educational Review*, 55, (1), 53-68.

Gardner, H. (1983). Artistic Intelligences. *Art Education*. 36, (2), 47-49.

Gardner, H. (1989). Project Zero: an Introduction to Arts Propel. *Journal of Art & Design Education. 8, (2),* 167-182.

Gardner, H. (1994). Intelligences in Theory and Practice: A Response to Elliot W. Eisner, Robert J. Sternberg, and Henry M. Levin. *Teachers College Record*, 95, (4), 576-583.

Gentile, J. R. & N. C. Murnyack. (1989). How Shall Students Be Graded in Discipline-Based Art Education. *Art Education.* 42, (6), 33-41.

Gilmour, J.C. (1994). Educating Imaginative Thinkers. *Teachers College Record.* 95, (4), 508-519.

Gitomer, D. & S. Grosh, K. Price. (1992). Portfolio Culture in Arts Education. *Art Education.* 45, (1), 7-15.

Greene, M. (1991). Texts and Margins. *Harvard Educational Review.* 61, (1), 27-39.

Greene, M. (1994). Carpe Diem: The Arts and School Restructuring. *Teachers College Record.* 95, (4), 494-507.

Greene, M. (1994). The Arts and National Standards. *The Educational Forum.* 58, 391-400.

Greene, M. (1992). The Role of The Arts in Independent Schools. In Pearl R. Kane (Ed.) Independent Schools, Independent Thinkers (pp. 190-205) San Francisco: Jossey- Bass.

Greer, W. D. (1992). Harry Broudy and Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE). *Journal of Aesthetic Education,* 26, (4), 49-60.

Greer, W.D. (1987) A Structure of Discipline Concepts for DBAE. *Studies in Art Education.* 28, (4), 227-233.

Greer, W. D. (1993). Developments in Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE): From Art Education Toward Arts Education. *Studies in Art Education.* 34, (2), 91-101.

Grexa, T. (1988) A Case for the International Baccalaureate. *The Journal of College Admission.* (121), 2-6.

Gruber, D.D. (1994). Evaluation of Student Achievement in K-12 Art Education Programs: A Balanced Approach. *Art Education,* 47, (2), 40-45.

Hamblen, K.A. (1987). An Examination of Discipline-Based Art Education Issues. *Studies in Art Education.* 28, (2), 68-78.

The Handbook of Private Schools. (1995), Boston: Porter Sargent Publishers, Inc.

Hausman, J.J. (1987). Another View of Discipline Based Art Education. *Art Education.* 40, (1), 56-60.

Hausman, J. J. (1988) Unity and Diversity in Art Education. In Burton, J. M., & Lederman, A., & London, P., (Eds.) (1988). Beyond DBAE: The Case for Multiple Visions of Art. University Council on Art Education.

Hausman, J. (1994). Standards and Assessment-New Initiative and Continuing Dilemmas. *Art Education*. 47, (2), 9-13.

Hausman, J.J. (1994) National Standards for Visual Arts Education. (NAEA Advisory, The National Art Education Association, Reston, VA)

Hausman, J.J. (1994a) National Standards for Visual Arts Education. *NAEA Advisory Series*, (Ed. A.N. Johnson).Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.

Hoffa, H. (1987) Preparing High School Students for Admission to College Art Departments. *Art Education*. 40, (1), 16-22.

Hoffa, Harlan. (1994). National Standards: The Whys and What Fors. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 96, (2), 16-25.

Holt, D. K. (1990). Post-Modernism vs. High-Modernism: The Relation to DBAE and its Critics. *Art Education*. 43, (2). 42-46.

Hope, S. (1995). Making Disciplinary Connections. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 96, (5), 26-30.

Hope, S. (1994). Art, Power, and Arts Education. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 95, (6), 2-14.

Hope, S. (1993). An Open Letter on Standards. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 95, (1), 36-39.

Huber, B.W. (1987). What does Feminism Have to Offer DBAE? Or So What If Little Red Riding Hood Puts Aside Her Crayons to Deliver Groceries For Her Mother? *Art Education*. 40, (3), 37-41.

International Baccalaureate Program Materials, (1995) New York

Irvin, R. L. & J.K. Reynolds. (1995) Integration as a Strategy for Teaching the Arts as Disciplines. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 96, (4), 13-19.

Jacobs, H.H. (Ed.) (1989). Interdisciplinary Curriculum: Design and Implementation. ASCD.

Kindler, A. (1992) Discipline Based Art Education in Secondary Schools: a Possible Approach. *Journal of Art & Design Education*, 11, (3), 345-355.

Kleinbauer, W.E. (1987) Art History in Discipline-based Art Education. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 21, (2), 205-215.

Klingensmith, B. , (Ed.) (1993). Prelude to Performance Assessment in the Arts: Kindergarten through Grade Twelve. California Department of Education, Sacramento, CA.

LaChapelle, J.R. (1991) In the Night Studio: The Professional Artist As an Educational Role Model. *Studies in Art Education*. 32 (3) 160-170.

Lanier, V. (1987). A*R*T*, A Friendly Alternative to DBAE, *Art Education* . 40, (5), 46-52.

Lederman, A. (1998). Art for the Real World. In Burton, J. M., & Lederman, A., & London, P., (Eds.) (1988). Beyond DBAE: The Case for Multiple Visions of Art. University Council on Art Education.

Levin, H.M. (1994) Commentary: Multiple Intelligence Theory and Everyday Practices. *Teachers College Record,* 95 (4), 570-575.

Lidstone, J. (1988). Conversations with Myself. In Burton, J. M., & Lederman, A., & London, P., (Eds.) (1988). Beyond DBAE: The Case for Multiple Visions of Art. University Council on Art Education.

London, P. (1988) To Gaze Again at the Stars. In Burton, J. M., & Lederman, A., & London, P., (Eds.) (1988). Beyond DBAE: The Case for Multiple Visions of Art. University Council on Art Education.

Manley-Delacruz, E. (1990). Revisiting Curriculum Conceptions: A Thematic Perspective. *Visual Arts Research.* 16, (2), 10-25.

MENC, (1994) National Standards for Arts Education:Dance, Music, Theater, Visual Arts: What Every Young American Should Know and Be Able to Do in the Arts. Reston, VA, Music Educators National Conference.

MENC, (1994) Summary Statement: Education Reform, Standards, and the Arts, Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.

MENC, (1994) The Vision for Arts Education in the 21st Century. Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.

Mitchell, R. & A. Stempell. (1991) The Advanced Placement Studio Art Portfolio Evaluation: A Case Study of National Portfolio Assessment. (Six Case-Studies of Performance Assessment Prepared For the Office of Technology Assessment, Council For Basic Education.

MacGregor, R. N. (1992) DBAE: At The Secondary Level: Compounding Primary Gains. *NAASP Bulletin.* 73, (517), 23-29.

McMurrin, L.R. (1992) Principal's Role in Implementing Discipliine-Based Art Education. *NAASP Bulletin,* 73, (517), 31-34.

Myford, C.M. & R.J. Mislevy. (1995) Monitoring and Improving a Portfolio Assessment System. (Center For Performance Assessment, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, NJ)

NAEA, (1994) The National Visual Arts Standards. Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.

NAEA (1996) Briefing Papers: Creating a Visual Arts Research Agenda Toward The 21st Century, NAEA Commission on Research in Art Education, Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.

NAEA (1994) Maintaining A Substantive Focus: A look at Performance Assessment for Art Education, Visual Arts Education Reform Handbook, Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.

NAEA (1995) Suggested Policy Perspectives for Professional Development, Visual Arts Education Reform Handbook, Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.

NAIS (1984), Arts Planning Group Report, Boston: National Association of Independent Schools.

Peterson, A.D.C. (1983) Learning From Experience in the International Baccalaureate Program. *The Journal of General Education*, 35, (1), 15-25.

Qualley, C.A. (1989). Discipline-Based Art Education: Seeking Its Origins and Considering the Alternatives. *NAASP Bulletin*. 73, (517),1-6.

Risatti, H. (1987) Art Criticism in Discipline-based Art Education. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*. 21, (2), 217-225.

Ross, J. (1994). National Standards for Arts Education: The Emperor's New Clothes. 96, (2), 26-30.

Roucher, N. & Jessie Lovano-Kerr. (1995) Can the Arts Maintain Integrity in Interdisciplinary Learning? *Arts Education Policy Review*, 96, (4), 20-25.

Rubin, B.M. (1989) Using The Naturalistic Evaluation Process To Asses The Impact of DBAE. *NAASP Bulletin*, 73, (517), 36-41.

Rush, J. C. (1987). Interlocking Images: The Conceptual Core of a Discipline-Based Art Lesson. *Studies in Art Education*. 28, (4), 206-220.

Sikes, M. (1995) From Metaphoric Landscapes to Social reform: A Case for Holistic Curricula. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 96, (4), 26-31.

Silverman, R.H. (1988). The Egalitarianism of Discipline-Based Art Education. *Art Education*, 41, (2), 13 - 18.

Silverman, R.H. (1989). A Rationale for Discipline-Based Art Education. *NAASP Bulletin*, 73, (517), 17-22.

Smith, R.A. (1995). The Limits and Costs of Integration in Arts Education. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 96, (5), 21-25.

Spratt, F. (1987) Arts Production in Discipline-based Art Education. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*. 21, (2), 197-204.

Sylva, R. (1993). Creation and Re-Creation in Art Education. *Art Education*, 46, (1), 7-11.

Sternberg, R.J. (1994) Commentary: Reforming School Reform: Comments on Multiple Intelligences: The Theory in Practice. *Teachers College Record*, 95, (4), 561-569.

Stinespring, J.A. (1992). DBAE and Criticism. *Arts Education Policy Review*. 94, (2), 20-25.

Sullivan, G. (1989). Curriculum in Art Education: The Uncertainty Principle. *Studies in Art Education, 30 (4), 225-236.*

Thomas, P. B. (1988) Students Across Frontiers. *The Journal of College Admissions*. (121), 7-10.

Thomas, P. B. (1988) University Destinations and Performance of IB Diploma Holders, *The Journal of College Admissions*, (121), 11-14.

Tyson, D.C. (1984). A Test of Character: The International Baccalaureate in America. *Independent School.*. 44, (1), 55-56.

Wieder, C.E. (1990) Essentialist Tools of the DBAE Approach to Curriculum: A Critique, *Visual Arts Research*, 16, (2), 26-30.

Welter, C.H. (1993). Grade-Level Assessment in the Arts: of Stoppages and Stratagems. *Arts Education Policy Review*. 94, (5), 2-8.

Winner, E. & S. Simmons (Eds.). (1993) Arts Propel: A Handbook For Visual Arts. Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J. Policy Information Center.

Wolf, D.P & T. Wolf (1985) Academic Preparation in the Arts: Teaching for Transition From High School To College. New York: The College Board.

Wolf, D.P. & N. Pistone (1995) Taking Full Measure: Rethinking Assessment Through the Arts. New York: The College Board.

Zessoules, R. & Wolf, D. P. & Gardner, H. . Better Balance: ARTS PROPEL as an Alternative to Discipline Based Art Education. In Burton, J. M., & Lederman, A., & London, P., (Eds.) (1988). Beyond DBAE: The Case for Multiple Visions of Art. University Council on Art Education.